COPYRIGHT ARBITRATION ROYALTY PANEL

BEFORE THE

GENERAL COUNSELL

OF COPYRIGHT

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

DEC 18 1995

RECEIVED

DISTRIBUTION OF 1990,

1991 AND 1992

CABLE ROYALTY FUNDS

Docket No. 94-3-CARP-CD90-92

Hearing Room 414, Fourth Floor Madison Building Library of Congress 101 Independence Avenue, S.E. Washington D.C.

Monday, December 11, 1995

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE MEL R. JIGANTI, Chairperson

THE HONORABLE JOHN B. FARMAKIDES

THE HONORABLE RONALD WERTHEIM

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Joint Sports Claimants:

Major League Baseball

ROBERT ALAN GARRETT, ESQ., DAVID D. GERSCH, ESQ., and PETER G. NEIMAN, ESQ.

of: Arnold & Porter
555 12th Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20004-1202
(202) 942-5444

National Basketball Association and National Hockey League

PHILIP R. HOCHBERG, ESQ.

of: Baraff, Koerner, Olender & Hochberg, P.C.

Suite 640

Three Bethesda Metro Center

Bethesda, Maryland 20814-5330

(301) 686-3200

National Collegiate Athletic Association

JUDITH JUIN SEMO, ESQ.
of: Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
Suite 400
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-6606

On Behalf of Devotional Claimants:

CLIFFORD M. HARRINGTON, ESQ.
BARRY H. GOTTFRIED, ESQ.
of: Fisher, Wayland, Cooper, Leader
& Zaragoza, L.L.P.
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 420
Washington D.C. 20006-1851
(202) 775-3539

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES: (cont.)

On Behalf of Devotional Claimants: (cont.)

RICHARD M. CAMPANELLI, ESQ. GEORGE R. GRANGE, II, ESQ. Gammon & Grange, P.C.

of: Gammon & Grange, P.C.
Seventh Floor
8280 Greensboro Drive
McLean, Virginia 22102-3807
(703) 761-5000

JOHN H. MIDLEN, JR.
Chartered
3238 Prospect Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20007-3214
(202) 333-1500

On Behalf of the National Association of Broadcasters:

BENJAMIN F.P. IVINS, ESQ.
MELISSA BLEVINS, ESQ.
National Association of Broadcasters

of: National Association of Broadcasters 1771 N Street, N.W. Washington D.C. 20036 (202) 429-5460

JACQUELINE E. HAND, ESQ. JOHN J. STEWART, ESQ.

of: Crowell & Moring
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20004-2595
(202) 624-2793

On Behalf of the Canadian Claimants:

VICTOR J. COSENTINO, ESQ. L. KENDALL SATTERFIELD, ESQ. Finkelstein, Thompson & Lough

of: Finkelstein, Thompson & Loughran 2828 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington D.C. 20007 (202) 337-8000

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES: (cont.)

On Behalf of the Public Broadcasting Corporation Claimants:

GARY D. POON, ESQ.
Assistant General Counsel
1320 Braddock Place
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 739-7532

MICHELE J. WOODS, ESQ.
TIMOTHY C. HESTER, ESQ.
of: Covington & Burling
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
P.O. Box 7566
Washington D.C. 20044
(202) 662-5324

On Behalf of the Program Suppliers:

Motion Picture Association of America:

DENNIS LANE, ESQ.,
of: Morrison & Hecker, L.L.P.
1150 18th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington D.C. 20036-3816
(202) 785-9100

1166

1172

1177

1320

1322

1325

1341

1230

1198

1198

1199

1352

1352

1352

1352

1246

1246

		INDE	X		
<u>WITNESS</u>		DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
Trygve Myhro By Mr. Ge By Mr. La By Mr. He By Ms. Ha	rsch ne ster	1127	1150 1199 1227	1247	
James Moone By Mr. Ge By Mr. La	rsch	1252	1301		
·	E	XHIB	ITS		
Exhibit No.	<u>Descri</u>	otion		Marked	Received
Program Sup	pliers				
16-X	New Engla Systems	nd Colony	Cable	1157	1196
1				_	İ

National Association of Broadcasters 1990-92 2-X NAB Exhibit 12

Development

March 1992

Flagship Station

New York Colony Cable System

New York Colony Cable System

Ad from CableVision 05-04-95

Ad from CableVision 03-25-91

Regional Sports Network Guide

NCTA Cable Television

Factbook

1990-92 3-X Transcript from 1980 Hearing 1233

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

17-X

18-X

19-X

20-X

21-X

22-X

23-X

24-X

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:37 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Preliminarily, we have something that we were discussing, and there is something we would like. We view this as a cooperative effort from the beginning between arbitrators and the counsel there, and we ask your cooperation on this.

We take your briefs, now whether it is each party individually, whether you cooperate in groups or you cooperate all in one brief, it makes no difference to us.

Here is what we are interested in. We are interested in the brief on the law. The law in the sense of what power does this panel have.

Obviously it comes from 801 nd 802 and proceeding from there and it proceeds on to the -- we go from power and we get into what should be persuasive with this panel, and that gets into legislative history, which I have for 1976.

I don't have anything further. We received some things over the weekend, maybe there is more there, and prior rulings of the Tribunal, but specifically, what we do not want when you consider these things, is we do not want anything concerning

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

the variances between Bortz and Nielsen.

That is not what we are comfortable with or what we need any sort of direction or guidance on.

We would like to know your views of the law.

Furthermore, we would like you to comment on a sentence from the 1989 Tribunal decision, and that sentence is contained at page 15-288.

It is in this second column, the first full paragraph. It is the last sentence. The sentence reads as follows: "Should the Tribunal continue the basis upon which it has made its distribution or should it adopt a new basis."

I don't mean to strike terror into your hearts because you have presented all of your testimony here, but we are not certain what that means, and we would like to have your comments on that.

Thirdly, we would also like to have your comments concerning that portion of the opinion which is the rationale that leads up to the distribution.

It is contained at -- well it starts -- typically Program Suppliers, as an example -- is at page 15-302 and it says "Program Suppliers," and it is under the heading

of -- you can find the heading on it, but the import

NEAL R. GROSS

of what we have to say is that they make a conclusion there in both paragraphs, and they have a rationale there.

We would like your comments, if you have any comments on the rationale used by the Tribunal at that time.

Those are my comments. I hope you can comply with our request. The timing for the reply -- well, we would like to have it before we break here at the middle of next week so we could have it to think about as we go home over the holidays, or I go home, other parties leave for their holidays also.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: If I could amplify or add something, I am particularly interested in the parties' views that distinguish between what we must do and what we may do.

There is a section or provision in, I believe it is section 882, it says, "Decisions are to be made on the basis of a variety of things."

That doesn't say whether that is to be binding or whether it is persuasive, whether you are just supposed to take those things into account or what.

Furthermore, with regard to the '89 final determination, and being perhaps a little more candid

than our chairperson has just been, frankly reading that decision -- the first time I read it, it went on and on and on for many pages, summarizing this party argues this, that party argues that, and then when we got to the final decision about where the Tribunal is coming down, the reasons seems extremely concise, let me say.

I don't know whether the parties' feel that that is the sort of reasoning they are looking for from this panel or whether you think something a little more elaborate is called for, but if so, I appreciate you being as specific as you can be as to what that should be.

It is not, in my view, very satisfactory for anyone. It seems the court of appeals kind of threw up its hands and said, "Well, we just couldn't do much better than to say, 'Well, we have got this, and we have got that, so let's, out of somewhere, pick a number in between.'"

Although the court of appeals, for the most part, swallowed that, it seems like the parties think that Congress expects anything different from this panel.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: We wanted to start our discussion basically with you at this stage rather

NEAL R. GROSS

than wait for proposed findings of fact much later in the proceedings.

right now? I don't know that we will sit in the form of being a deposition, and we will answer interrogatories, but if you have some sort of general questions for us, we will be glad to entertain them, or if you want to do it a little bit later, after you have adjusted this.

I spoke to the court reporter earlier in the proceedings today, anticipating this, and the court reporter said that you can listen to this portion of the transcript before he gives it to somebody who comes in at noon today to pick up the tape, and it wouldn't be available until tomorrow.

That is for your benefit. Not hearing any responses to it, we will proceed, and we will hear about it later if need be.

One thing I would like to comment on is the admission of exhibits, and we have got a little bit of a problem I guess.

All exhibits are admissible if there is a sponsor. Basically, I think under the rules -- and I have required you to say, "We ask for this to be admitted."

NEAL R. GROSS

2.0

1	Particularly on cross. The reason is that
2	I am not certain at that stage that we go through the
3	procedure that you could go through exhibits when you
4	are presenting your direct case, that is, somebody is
5	allowed to question the witness to see if they are
6	really a proper sponsor, and then it leaves the record
7	somewhat ambiguous. That is what prompted me to do
8	something like that, to require you to specifically
9	offer it, but that is our problem.
LO	I think, is there a basis for the exhibit,
11	and if there is a sponsor, if there is a sponsor for
12	the exhibits I don't think anyone even has to make an
13	exclusion in order to exclude it from the record.
14	As we go along I don't know quite how to
15	handle that, but let's make sure that we have a
16	sponsor, and then we will proceed with it from there.
17	Ready to proceed this morning? Mr.
18	Gersch, your first witness.
19	MR. GERSCH: Yes. Joint sports claimants
20	call Mr. Trygve Myhren.
21	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Mr. Myhren, will you
22	take this seat over here. Thank you very much.
23	THE WITNESS: All set.
24	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay.
25	Whereupon,

TRYGVE MYHREN 1 was called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, 2 was examined and testified as follows: 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. GERSCH: 5 Would you please state your name, sir. 6 7 Tryqve Myhren. Α currently 8 Q Mr. Myhren, how are you 9 employed? I am the President and Director of the Α 1.0 Providence Journal Company. 11 Okay. You have held that position since 12 approximately 1990. Is that right? 13 Since 1990. . A 14 And in that time the Providence Journal 15 has owned a number of television properties. Is that 16 17 correct? We own 11 television stations, one ABC, Α 18 one CBS, five NBC stations, a couple of Fox stations, 19 and a couple of stations that are affiliated with the 20 new United Paramount network. 21 These are all broadcast stations? 22 broadcast television They are all 23 The largest one is in Seattle, the second 24 largest one is in Portland, Oregon, those are both NBC 25 **NEAL R. GROSS**

We have a NBC affiliate in Charlotte, 2 North Carolina, an ABC in Louisville, and so on, 3 across the country, and in fact, even in Honolulu. With respect to the NBC affiliates. You 5 0 say you own five affiliates. 6 The five NBC affiliations make us the Α 7 second largest group owner affiliated with NBC. So we 8 are a substantial factor in the broadcast business. 9 All right. Until very, very recently the 10 Providence Journal also owned a number of cable 11 systems. Is that correct? 12 owned approximately 800,000 cable Wе 13 subscribers, also across the country. On October 5th 14 sale of those subscribers to concluded a 15 Continental Cablevision, which when it closed, made 16 them the third largest multiple system operator. 17 We were the 15th largest. We sold to 18 Continental and they became the third largest. 19 When you say October the 5th --20 O October the 5th of this year. · A 21 So just two months ago. 0 22 Yes. We just closed that sale. Right. Α 23 Does the Providence Journal have interests 24 25 in cable networks? NEAL R. GROSS

affiliates.

A We do. Beginning in 1990, when I came with the company, we began to develop video programming. We now are the general partner and manage and partly own a network called the Television Food Network, which is distributed to a little over 15 million households now.

It has actually been in existence -- after the planning stage -- it has actually been in existence for a little over two years. We are in front of 15 million households, doing about a .4 rating.

We also are about to introduce in the northwest, on December 18th, a 24 hour news channel for cable, for just the northwestern part of the country, which is the product, really, of our four broadcast stations there.

In addition to that we have affiliations with the Mayo Clinic and the New England Journal of Medicine for something called America's Health Network, which will debut on cable at the end of March, of '96.

Q Let's go to the period 1990 through 1992. What involvement did you have with respect to the cable systems owned by the Providence Journal in that time period?

A Obviously, in my position I did not directly manage the cable systems, because we are a multi-media company, but I obviously was very aware of what was going on in those cable systems because I have a long cable background.

When decisions that had to do with public policy or programming or marketing or major capital expenditures, for example, came up, obviously I would review them and generally held discussions with regard to how the cable systems were doing and what they were doing with the people in cable operation.

Q You made reference to your long cable background. How were you employed prior to becoming president of the Providence Journal?

A For a brief period of time I had a company called Myhren Media, my last name, in Denver, Colorado, in which I consulted to a lot of cable companies.

I also consulted to CBS, for example. I also consulted to some telephone companies and others, but primarily to companies that were in the cable business, and actually bought some cable systems of my own, which I still own down in southern Arizona.

Prior to that, in the period from 1975 to the end of 1988, I was with a company called American

NEAL R. GROSS

Television and Communications, which was initially a public company, and then became a private company when it was bought by Time, Incorporated, and then became a public company again in 1986 when we took it back out to the public, but still then majority owned by Time, Incorporated.

That company is today Time Warner Cable. I was the CEO chairman of that company from 1981 through 1988. That company, by the way, at the time that I left had about 4-1/2 million cable subscribers. Today that company is the second largest multiple system operator in the business.

Q Before you became chairman and CEO of ATC, did you hold another position there?

A Before chairman I was actually president and COO, and before that I was executive vice president, and before that senior vice president, and originally a vice president.

My concentration, when I came into the company as a vice president, was marketing and programming. I then added other functions, but I would say that the core of my expertise as I went through those years at American Television and Communications, had to do with the marketing and programming areas.

1	Q Now, will you have any responsibilities
2	with respect to Continental, the company that bought
3	the Providence Journal's cable properties?
4	A I am currently a director of Continental
5	Cablevision.
6	Q Have you had a role with respect to the
7	National Cable Television Association? The trade
8	association for the industry?
9	A About the time that I became chairman CEO
10	at American Television and Communications, I became a
11	I went on the board of the National Cable
12	Television Association, and I was on that board into
13	1989 ⁻ .
14	So it was '81 into '89. Interestingly
15	enough, later, when I left ATC, I became a small
16	operator member of the National Cable Board, but
17	during those earlier years I was at one point
18	treasurer, at another point secretary, at another
19	point vice chairman, and eventually chairman of the
20	National Cable Board in 1986 and 1987.
21	Q One thing I may have neglected to ask you
22	about ATC, during the period you were there at ATC,
23	where did it rank among MSOs in the United States?
24	A Variously first and second during that
25	period in terms of size.

1	Q Sure. What is CTAM?
2	A It is the Cable Television Administration
3	and Marketing Society. It is the primary organization
4	in cable dealing with issues such as defining customer
5	needs, the research, looking at program viewership,
6	looking at marketing, looking at customer service.
7	It is the customer oriented part of the
8	cable business.
9	Q And you are one of the founders of CTAM?
10	A I was one of the three founders of CTAM
11	and was later on its president and have maintained a
12	relationship with CTAM over the years.
13	Q Why was there a need for an organization
14	like CTAM?
15	A In the cable business originally
16	certainly when I entered it in early 1975 and prior to
17	that period the business had been built by people
18	who were entrepreneurs, whose background really was in
19	many cases, electrical engineering, electronics.
20	Many of them had been trained in the armed
21	service, and had come out and run electronic stores,
22	tried to sell television sets.
23	It was not easy to do in some rural
24	communities where there wasn't much television.
25	They came up with this idea of
	NEAL R. GROSS

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

transporting the signals from the bigger cities and creating cable television. You had those people.

You had the people who financed them. You had construction people. These were the kinds of people who peopled the cable television business and created the little companies that eventually began to grow.

There wasn't much thought beyond, "Gee, people would like some television signals." There wasn't thought about how important it was to have those signals be reliable and clear, and more importantly just what the fare on cable was, how good the programming was or wasn't, how appealing it was, how good your service was or wasn't. Did you answer the telephone? Did you do those kinds of things.

When I came into the business, a couple of other people and I looked at it and said, "Wow, we have got a long way to go. We better introduce this concept of customer service, and we better worry about what kind of programming we have and whether people are really interested in that."

Q Mr. Myhren, you are the recipient of a number of awards, and I just want to ask you about a couple of them. In 1988 you were the recipient of the Vanguard Leadership Award. Is that right?

1	A Yes.
2	Q And that awards the person who exemplifies
3	the most outstanding leadership qualities in the
4	industry that year?
5	. A As defined by the National Cable
6	Association. Right.
7	Q You have also won the CTAM Grand TAM
8	Award. Is that right?
9	A That is correct.
10	Q And that is also an award for the person
11	who has had the most impact on the industry?
12	A Yes. I think in my case, those awards
13	were made in two different time periods during my
14	career, but I think they were both pretty much for the
15	same things.
16	One was a concentration on customers,
17	customer service, and the other one was for the fact
18	that I had had some impact in the work leading up to
19	the 1984 Cable Act, which was the act that deregulated
20	the cable industry.
21	Q Mr. Myhren, in addition to your positions
22	over the Providence channel, you have served on the
23	public board of the Turner Broadcasting System. Is
24	that right?
25	A Correct.

1	Q You have also served as a director of HBO?
2	A That position is an internal directorship
3	at Time, Inc., now Time Warner.
4	Q And you served on the board of the Video
5	Jukebox network. Is that right?
6	A This is true.
7	Q And I understand that in September of this
8	year CableVision Magazine named you one of the 20
9	people who has had the greatest impact on the cable
10	industry. Is that right?
11	A That is correct.
12	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: What magazine was
	that?
13	
13	MR. GERSCH: CableVision.
14	MR. GERSCH: CableVision.
14	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH:
14 15 16	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH: Q In addition to your cable television
14 15 16	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH: Q In addition to your cable television positions, Mr. Myhren, you have had involvement with
14 15 16 17	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH: Q In addition to your cable television positions, Mr. Myhren, you have had involvement with sports. Is that right?
14 15 16 17 18	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH: Q In addition to your cable television positions, Mr. Myhren, you have had involvement with sports. Is that right? A I have. I have been I have always
14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH: Q In addition to your cable television positions, Mr. Myhren, you have had involvement with sports. Is that right? A I have. I have been I have always loved sports, like many of us, but the, I guess on the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH: Q In addition to your cable television positions, Mr. Myhren, you have had involvement with sports. Is that right? A I have. I have been I have always loved sports, like many of us, but the, I guess on the organizational or commercial side of sports, the two
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GERSCH: CableVision. BY MR. GERSCH: Q In addition to your cable television positions, Mr. Myhren, you have had involvement with sports. Is that right? A I have. I have been I have always loved sports, like many of us, but the, I guess on the organizational or commercial side of sports, the two recent things that might be of interest here, one is

1	Colorado Rockies, which is something we all feel
2	pretty good about right now.
3	In any event, I also was the chairman last
4	year of the NCAA final four hockey, which was in
5	Providence, Rhode Island, which is where I am now
6	living.
7	MR. GERSCH: At this time, panel members
8	and Mr. Chairman, we tender Mr. Myhren for any voir
9	dire.
10	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Questions? No
11	questions? Very good. You may proceed, Mr. Gersch.
12	BY MR. GERSCH:
13	Q Mr. Myhren, what is the purpose of your
14	testimony here today?
15	A I think I have been asked to try to
16	discuss my understanding of the way cable operators
17	choose programming and why, and what is of valuable to
18	them and what is less valuable.
19	Q Are you familiar with Bortz and Company?
20	A Yes. I am.
21	Q Who are they?
22	A Well, Paul Bortz and his people do
23	consulting, and a fair amount of research in the media
24	businesses. They are highly regarded by people in the
25	broadcast television business, and the cable business,

1	and I think the entertainment businesses in general,
2	I would say.
3	Q Do you understand that Bortz and Company
4	did a survey for the joint sports claimants
5	represented here?
6	A I am aware of that.
7	. Q And what is your understanding of the
8	kinds of results that Bortz and Company received?
9	A Well, at least as I glanced at it, what
10	they did was to do research with cable operators as to
11	how they value the programming that is available on
12	distant signals.
13	They tried to categorize that programming,
14	sports, movies, syndicated programming, PBS offerings,
15	et cetera.
16	As I remember it, they felt that cable
17	operators in that context in the distant signal
18	context feel that the most valuable piece of
19	programming to them or the type of programming, is
20	sports.
21	The second most valuable is movies. The
22	third most valuable I think, syndicated, and so on.
23	Q And were those results consistent with
24	your experience in the cable business in the 1990 -
25	1992 period?
1	NEAL D. ODOCO

23

24

25

	_		
A	Ahao	lutely	
\vdash	AUSU	エルレーエッ	•

Q Let's turn to page 3 of your written testimony where you discuss what it is about programming which generates value to the cable operator.

I would ask you if you could explain your opinion on that subject to the panel.

A Well, I think you have to understand, to understand how the cable operator thinks about this, how the cable business is structured economically, because that is obviously at the core of what the operator is thinking.

The cable business is a business where you have to get people to subscribe and pay money regularly or you are out of business.

If you get some advertising revenues as a cable operator, that is nice, but interestingly, it is only about 5 percent of your revenues. The rest of your revenues come from other things, which are primarily subscriptions.

It is a very different business from the broadcast business. Broadcast television, which we are also in, where 100 percent of your revenues come from advertising, and none come from subscriptions.

They are just very different businesses,

NEAL R. GROSS

and so you are driven, as a cable operator, to look at your programming and the way that you appeal to subscribers.

If you want to have a broad subscription base in a way that appeals to every part of the population, the way that you do that is you have a lot of channels and you put different things on different channels.

I always tend to think of it this way: what I want to do is to have programming -- by the time you get done with my channel line up -- which has something for everybody.

It has got to have enough of each something so that I don't just whet the appetite so that they subscribe and then later drop off.

I have got to do more than whet the appetite. I have got to have enough so that I satisfy them in that regard.

That is the key, and frankly, that is at the core of the reason why you get very deeply into how types of programming differ from each other.

Q How does sports fit under that criteria that you just described in terms of how cable operators value programming?

A Sports is very different from, for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

example, if you look at the super station model or the distant signal model, where you have sports, and you have syndicated, and you have movies, and you have these various other types of programming, because sports is perishable, and the others are not.

The way that you build a successful movie studio is by having libraries of programming which keeps playing and playing, and you keep getting revenues from it.

When the Cubs played the Cardinals, it is over. It is a one time showing. That tends to translate itself into a situation where, from the viewer standpoint, the person that I, as a cable operator, am trying to get to subscribe, I can appeal to people by saying, "If you have this channel which is on cable, you are going to get certain of these games, and if you don't get them, they are gone." That can't be said about any of the other type of programming.

I mean, if you are going to have movies, which I think are very valuable programming, to everyone, including the cable operator, but movies can be gotten in the movie theater, and they can be gotten in the video store, and they will have previously, by the time they get to a superstation they will

previously have been shown on broadcast television, and they probably have been shown in pay television, on a cable system, but on a different tier of programming.

They have been exposed and exposed and exposed. That is real good for a movies studio who is able to take money out at each stage as they run their windows, they call their windows.

The sports people are in a different situation. I am not so, frankly, as interested in the seller perspective, I am interested in the buyer perspective, which is, what does that do for the viewer?

Well, for the viewer, the viewer doesn't get another chance at that sports stuff. So, for those people, not everyone in the world is interested in sports, but for those people who are, and there are a large number of people who are, first the idea of missing is a stimulant to their purchase behavior, missing something, and second, the idea of being able to get it is important to them.

So we find that, and I have always felt, that sports is enormously important, particularly in this distant signal configuration, because there are a lots of other movies available other places on

cable.

There is lots of other syndicated programming, and frankly, there is some other sports on cable, in the basic cable package, but the sports that are here, you can only get here, and once they are shown, they are gone. That is the perishable nature. That plays an enormous role.

Q Do the Providence Journal cable properties carry sports on distant signals during the 1990-1992 time period?

- A Sure.
- Q What kinds of sports?

A Oh, we, I mean, on various of our cable systems we had WTBS, WGN, WOR, WPIX, for example, our New England cable systems, depending upon which system, we had any and all of those.

It is interesting, in New England, just like there is anywhere in the country, there are a lot of Cub fans, people who have moved from the midwest, people who enjoy the National League, might have been a Mets fan in New York, and knew the Cubs. So WGN, interestingly enough, is even important in New England.

There is also the fact that WPIX, for example, out of New York, there are a lot of Yankee

NEAL R. GROSS

fans in New England, so getting WPIX from New York up 1 there is very important. 2 There is also WSBK out of Boston, which 3 isn't a distant signal in the Boston market, but 4 mostly outside of the Boston market, but not always, 5 is a distant signal. 6 That is very important to New Englanders, 7 many of whom are obviously Red Sox fans but don't live 8 9 in the Boston market. There aren't a lot of teams in New 10 There is one major league team. So this is 11 a very effective product there. 12 I have my own cable systems in southern 13 Arizona, we had WTBS and WGN, we considered them 14 enormously important. 15 So you had Cub fans out in Arizona? 16 Listen, a lot of people from Chicago just 17 in that area of the midwest, tend to retire out there. 18 You mention that there are other sources 19 of movies on the cable line ups that cable systems 20 carry. What are some of those other sources of movie 21 programming that the Providence Journal properties 22 might have carried in the 1990-1992 time period? 23 There are American Movie Classics, which Α 24 is really all movies. TNT, which is Turner Network 25 **NEAL R. GROSS**

Television, which has lots of movies, also has some sports. USA Network, a lot of movies and syndicated shows, also has a little bit of sports.

Q You said in your prepared testimony that as a cable operator, if you could have the people watch the movies on something other than distant signal, that would be in your view advantageous, and you get the distant signal so you can get the sports. Why is that?

this thing, if I can take the distant signal down and just leave the sports on, and get rid of the syndicated portion and the movie portion, that would open up the opportunity to advertise, which, I don't know if this has been described during the proceedings so far, but one of the things about a distant signal, as a cable operator you cannot place your own advertising on it.

You have got to take the whole block as it comes, but that is a bit of a facetious comment. The fact is from an economic standpoint, I will go back to the core economics here, which is what drives the cable operator, I would rather have people buy HBO or Showtime or Movie Channel or Cinemax or one of the pay television offerings to watch their movies than watch

it on basic cable, if I had my druthers.

So that is why I said that in testimony, that the sports offering is critical to me there, but frankly, if I had my choice I would rather have the movies and the syndicated -- well, the syndicated stuff I don't think would sell on a pay television offering -- but move the movies up to the pay television offering.

Q Let's go to page 5 of your testimony where you are talking about the relationship between Nielsen ratings and value.

Let me ask you this question: Do you believe that royalties should be distributed in this proceeding based on Nielsen type viewing data?

A I don't think the Nielsen ratings make any
-- let me say first, cable operators don't pay any
attention to Nielsen ratings.

Let's start right there. They don't really have anything to do with the way the operator believes they have got to gain subscribers and keep them, which I said at the outset, is what the economics of the cable business is all about.

The key to gaining subscribers and keeping them is to make sure that that subscriber, as I said, has something on there or some things that are

NEAL R. GROSS

enormously appealing to them, and that you have got enough of that.

I will tell you now that if we didn't have any movies or syndicated product or PBS product or whatever, if we didn't have those things on cable, we would already have enough.

In other words, we would have enough to appeal to the group that want those things, and we would have enough depth so that we wouldn't just whet their appetite. They would be well taken care of.

The same thing really can't be said about sports. I mean, the fact is that because sports is perishable, once again, because that game only takes place once, you can't say that because you have some other sports over here, that satisfies the appetite, it just doesn't.

I mean, because that particular Cardinals/Cubs game, or whichever one we want to choose, you know, the Orlando Magic and the Bulls, that game just plain doesn't happen over on that other sports if it is on the distant signal sports.

That really is the distinction. I don't know if I am being clear here, but to us, as we buy cable programming, that is just a critical distinction.

Q Is it your experience that with respect to the various -- I will withdraw the question.

When you say that to you cable operators, that the Nielsen ratings wouldn't be very important to you, is that your experience on the Providence Journal on both the broadcast side and the cable properties?

A I am not making a general condemnation of Nielsen because in the broadcast business, I must tell you that we wake up in the morning looking at the Nielsens, and we go to bed thinking about them because it is a very -- as I said, the broadcast business is different.

One hundred percent of your revenues are advertising revenues, and the advertisers look at viewership in determining where they are going to place their advertising, and the Nielsens are -- there are various tools to figure that out, but the Nielsens are a very important tool in that realm.

So we consider that very seriously. That is not the issue in cable. It may be for a particular cable programmer who is selling advertising within that programming, but it isn't to the operator.

What the operator is concerned about is making sure that each group among the consumers, each potential viewer group has the programming that they

want to watch, and enough of it. It is a very different mind set.

Q So you are saying that it is the case that it wouldn't matter to an operator necessarily, that if a sports program had a lower Nielsen rating than a non-sports program.

A I could certainly see a situation in which somebody would say to me, "Gee whiz, USA has a 1.0 rating on a 24 hour basis, and ESPN has a 28."

I am not saying that is exactly what they are right now, but that is right in the ballpark, these things vary as you go along, but I could see a situation like that, and they would say, "And by the way, we are going to charge you exactly the same for USA and ESPN, and USA has this higher rating."

I would say, "No. I think I will take ESPN," because what is on USA is much more available elsewhere, what is on ESPN, isn't. Consequently, as a cable operator, I am going to take ESPN. To me, that is the guts of the argument, that it is certainly the way I see it when I sit down and look at cable programming, and the way that other operators look at cable programming.

Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren, we have no further questions at this time.

1	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay, who would like
2	to cross examine first?
3	MR. LANE: I will, Mr. Chairman.
4	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay.
5	MR. LANE: For the record, I am Dennis
6	Lane, here on behalf of Program Suppliers.
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. LANE:
9	Q Mr. Myhren, when you came in you were
10	talking about the food network. Do you recall that?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And did I hear you correctly mention that
13	they have 15 million subscribers?
14	A Yes. I did mention the Food Network, and
15	I did say that there are approximately 15 million
16	subscribing households.
17	Q Did I also hear you correctly to say that
18	they have a .4 rating?
19	A Right.
20	Q What is that?
21	A That is a Nielsen rating.
22	Q That is a Nielsen rating. Mr. Myhren, do
23	you have an ownership interest in the Rockies?
24	A No. I do not. I wish I did.
25	Q Could you tell us what the Colorado
	NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-	Q ies.
2	A Dennis, the reason that we didn't think we
3	could arrange it was that distant signals are sold as
4	a package, and it seems that is all tied together with
5	the copyright rules and the rules on transporting
6	signals.
7	So you couldn't really do that. You
8	couldn't say, "I just want this," from that package.
9	Q Further down on that page, under roman
10	IIIA, you say, "the programming line up for a cable
11	system." Do you mean all the channels that a cable
12	system carries?
13	A I don't see what you mean.
14	Q The first sentence.
15	A Yes. That is what I mean.
16	Q So that includes basic tiers, pay tiers,
17	pay per view, whatever else you carry?
18	A No.
19	Q No?
20	A No.
21	Q Okay.
22	A It really is the basic, and to the extent
23	that there is a tier that is not much more expensive
24	than the basic, then it includes that as well.
25	It emphatically does not include pay

NEAL R. GROSS

1	television. In other words, you want to appeal here
2	to the broadest range of people you can, that is the
3	most individual groups within what you consider to be
4	a relatively affordable level of programming.
5	Q Now, we have heard the term, "expanded
6	basic, " from prior witnesses. Are you including that
7	when you say "basic?
8	. A Yes. I am.
9	Q I take it you try to fill this demand by
10	offering a wide variety of channels?
11	A Exactly.
12	Q On page 4 of your testimony, in the first
13	paragraph, it is actually the carry-over paragraph
14	A You mean the one that comes from the other
15	page?
16	Q Yes, sir.
17	A Yes.
18	Q You refer to, "alternative sources of
19	sports on cable."
20	A Yes.
21	Q Do you see that?
22	A Right.
23	Q Can you tell us what those are or what
24	they were in 1990 to 1992?
25	A Well, they really can be anything from a

1	local high school game, which maybe the cable operator
2	is putting on, to the sports that might be on a USA
3	network, or a TNT.
4	Q Is ESPN an alternative?
5	A ESPN, absolutely.
6	Q What about regional sports networks, would
7	they be an alternative?
8	A No, because usually those are in the pay
9	category. We have made this distinction between pay
10	television and basic and tiered.
11	Q TNT is one?
12	A TNT is an alternative sports, it is
13	additional sports. It is interesting. I think the
14	word "alternative" here is probably not a particularly
15	good choice of word on my part because it leads you
16	away from the basic problem that the cable operator
17	talks about.
18	With a movie or a piece of syndicated
19	product, you probably have had lots of chances to see
20	that someplace else. I mean, that precise piece of
21	product you have had a chance to see somewhere else as
22	a consumer or a viewer.
23	With the sports that are on the distant
24	signals, there really isn't an alternative. As I say,
25	if you didn't see that particular game, on that
	NEAL R. GROSS

distant signal, there isn't another place to see it. 1 2 It is gone. Are you referring ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: 3 here to something more than WTBS and WGN as distant 4 5 signals? THE WITNESS: Yes. 6 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: What else are you 7 8 referring to? Well, WOR, I think it is THE WITNESS: 9 There are -- I think in the called WWOR. WPIX. 10 distant signal context there must be 1,400 television 11 stations in the United States. About half of those, 12 in some way or another, are used in the distant signal 13 context, but the vast majority of the sports are shown 14 on just a few of these, you know, the things that are 15 -- the GNs and the TBSs and WORs that are called 16 superstations, and a few others. 17 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Thank you. 18 What would high CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: 19 school basketball be carried on? 20 THE WITNESS: Well, the cable operator has 21 channels, like a local access channel. They have 22 government access channels. These are channels often 23 that were mandated in the municipal franchises. 24 Locally a cable operator will have cameras 25

and a studio and people they can call on to produce shows, and they may well do some high school games, some local high school games on that channel.

If there is a college in there, they may do those local games. In some cases they may even do Little League games.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Would independent broadcast channels have any of those games?

THE WITNESS: No. No. It would be unlikely that an independent broadcaster -- well, it depends on the size of the media market.

in town that Ι now have the Providence, the University of Rhode Island Providence College might well be on a network affiliate at some point, produced locally as their local programming or it might be on an independent broadcast station in Rhode Island, but we are talking about here things that are on a smaller scale, because you don't typically have a cable operator who owns an entire metropolitan market, certainly in the 1990, 1991, 1992 time frame, cable is just a scattered everything is just municipal franchise business, boundaries.

So you may have 20 or 80 municipal franchises within one media market. So I am talking

NEAL R. GROSS

24

25

1	about high school games and small college games that
2	would never rise to the importance that would put them
3	on a broadcast station which covers the entire media
4	market.
5	MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, at this time I
6	would like to show the witness, and introduce into
7	evidence a
8	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: What do you mean
9	when you say you are introducing it? Are you offering
10	it into evidence or do you just want to ask the
11	witness some questions about it?
12	MR. LANE: I would like to introduce it.
13	Since counsel hasn't had a chance yet to object to it,
14	I am giving him that opportunity.
15	It is a five page document. Mr. Myhren,
16	I would ask you, are these the
17	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Excuse me, how is it
18	marked?
19	MR. LANE: Exhibit 16-X, sir.
20	(Whereupon, the document
21	referred to was marked for
22	identification as Program
23	Supplier's Exhibit No. 16-X.)
24	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Because it is not
25	marked on our copies. I am sorry.
I	NEAL R GROSS

1	A Correct.
2	Q Now, Mr. Myhren, have you ever heard of
3	Cable Data Corporation or Tom Larson?
4	` A It doesn't jump to my mind.
5	Q Well, he collects data or the company
6	collects data from the statements of account, and this
7	page, I will represent to you, is a summary of the
8	information.
9	If we go across the columns at the top,
10	you see the accounting period, the monthly rate, the
11	number of subscribers, gross receipts, the royalty
12	paid, and then a list of the call signs for each of
13	the stations that were carried by the system.
14	I just ask you to look through this and
15	perhaps just looking at the subscribers and the
16	monthly rate and the call signs, does this comport
17	with what you understand to be the carriage on those
18	systems?
19	A This is going to take a little while.
20	Q Sure. Take all of the time that you want.
21	A Now, he is just listing, across the top,
22	distant signals?
23	Q No. If it has an "L" in the column, that
24	is local. If it has a "D" that is distant, and if it
25	has an asterisk, it wasn't carried in that particular
Ì	NEAL R. GROSS

1	period.
2	A He is then just listing broadcast
3	stations, but no other product?
4	Q Exactly. Exactly.
5	A Okay.
6	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: It is like an exam.
7	MR. LANE: Do you want to take a break?
8	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: No.
9	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Mr. Lane, I am not
10	sure I caught what you are representing the column on
11	the right to be. Is that the monthly rate for
12	subscribers?
13	MR. LANE: Yes, that they record on the
14	statements of account.
15	THE WITNESS: Did you want me to opine on
16	the rates and the subscribers and the royalties?
17	BY MR. LANE:
18	Q No.
19	A Just on the carriage?
20	Q Does this look like
21	A The only thing I am surprised by here is
22	that there is not WGN.
23	Q That was going to be my first question to
24	you, sir.
25	A Okay. That is the only thing that seems
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	to be amiss, and I would have to go back and check
2	that. Clearly, we were using, as I said, WTBS, WSBK,
3	WPIX for the Yankees, and so on, but I am not seeing
4	any GN here.
5	Q And you mentioned a number of times this
6	morning that the fans in New England wanted to see
7	Cubs games, but according to these records none of
8	your systems carry WGN.
9	A If these records are correct, Dennis, what
10	that says is that although we got them the Yankees
11	games, and we are getting them the Red Sox games, and
12	so on, we are not getting them the Cubs other than in
13	the context of WTBS.
14	Q On page 4 of your testimony you refer to
15	carriage of WWOR, do you not?
16	A Let me see. Page 4. I do.
17	Q If I look on the Massachusetts systems,
18	WWOR is in the far right hand column. Is it not?
19	A It is.
20	Q It appears, does it not, that as of the
21	beginning of 1988, you dropped WWOR from carriage?
22	A Yes. We did. We had it up until '88 and
23	then took it off.
24	Q Then if we look at the Rhode Island
25	systems, you never carried it on the Pawtucket system,
Ī	NEAL R. GROSS

1	did you?
2	A No, but we carried it on Westerly.
3	Q You carried it on Westerly.
4	A Correct.
5	Q Now, looking at WSBK for your systems, it
6	is about the fifth one in from the right hand side, is
7	it not?
8	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Which page are you
9	looking at?
10	MR. LANE: On the first page, sir.
11	THE WITNESS: Yes. The fourth one from
12	the right.
13	BY MR. LANE:
14	Q And that is a local station, is it not?
15	A It is carried as local in Fall River,
16	although I must tell you that there is a bit of
17	controversy over that issue which exists to this day.
18	Q At least as Colony reported it on its
19	statement of account, it was reported as local?
20	A Yes.
21	Q And if we look at Lowell on the second
22	page, the same situation exists. Correct? It was
23	reported as local.
24	A It was reported as local through the first
25	four, I think. That was the point that I made,
İ	NEAL R. GROSS

1	Dennis, when I said that with SBK one of the things
2	that happens is that in some cases, it is locally
3	it is carried as a local, and there are some places in
4	New England where it is not a local.
5	Q But on your systems it is always carried
6	as a local?
7	A That's right.
8	Q I am sorry, except for Westerly. Is that
9	right?
10	A Let's see. I had trouble finding it on
11	this Westerly line up here. I see it.
12	Q The fifth one from the right.
13	A I see it. It is distant on Westerly.
14	Q Okay. Now, do you also see on Westerly,
15	let's just stay with that, one of my all time favorite
16	stations, WLNE?
17	A All right.
. 18	Q That is approximately right under the "N"
19	in "cable television," at the top of the page. Do you
20	see that.
21	A Carried as local in Westerly?
22	Q Carried as local. Do you know whether
23	WLNE carries Red Sox games as part of the SBK network?
24	A I am trying to remember now whether they -
25	- I am trying to relate to the 1990 - 1992 time
1	NEAL R. GROSS

I can't answer that one, Dennis, I can't period. 1 remember. 2 MR. LANE: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I 3 would like to introduce as 17-X, Program Supplier's 4 Exhibit 17-X. 5 document the (Whereupon, 6 referred to was marked 7 identification Program as 8 Supplier's Exhibit No. 17-X.) 9 MR. MIDLEN: Excuse me. Are you finished 10 with 16-X? 11 No. Copies of the comments of 12 MR. LANE: the Office of the Commissioner of Baseball, and the 13 FCC docket number 93-21, implementation of section 26 14 of the Cable Television Competition Act of 1992, it 15 has Mr. Garrett's name on it, among others, and I have 16 just selected one exhibit from that, and I would ask 17 you to turn to that, Mr. Myhren. 18 The first page, it is actually the third 19 page of the exhibit, the first page is entitled 20 "flagship station." It has that as the first line, it 21 has the Boston Red Sox on the page. Do you see that? 22 It is the third page of the exhibit. 23 THE WITNESS: Somehow I am missing the Red 24 It is under the Orioles. Okay. Oh, there. 25 Sox. NEAL R. GROSS

1	BY MR. LANE:
2	Q Do you see WLNE identified as one of the
3	baseball regional television stations?
4	· A I sure do.
5	Q Does that refresh your recollection as to
6	carriage of Red Sox on WLNE?
7	A I was trying to figure out what the time
8	period was, though. That was the thing that was
9	confusing me here.
10	It is certainly on there now, that is what
11	is being said.
12	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: The second page of
13	the exhibit says, "1994 or now."
14	THE WITNESS: Right, and as I said
15	earlier. I was confused as to the time period "or
16	now." It is on now. What I am trying to remember is
17	whether it was a member of this flagship station
18	organization back in the 1991-1992 period, and I just
19	can't remember.
20	BY MR. LANE:
21	Q Okay. Now, turning to page 5 of your
22	testimony, at the top of the page, and again, it is
23	the carry-over paragraph. You refer to the words,
24	"alternative sources."
25	So I guess I better ask you to define how
	NEAL R. GROSS

4 5

you used it on page 5 here first.

Yes. You know, for example, a place for movies as an alternative source would be pay television, but certainly there are -- for syndicated programming or movies there are sources such as TNT, or a USA, or an AMC, and the reason that I say that they are more profitable for the cable operators -- the cable operator, on a distant signal, doesn't have any advertising availabilities.

All right. On those other programs, they do have advertising availabilities. So that in fact, I think the word "alternative" is properly used here.

Whereas I said I didn't use it properly with regard to other sports programming earlier, but the usage of movies for example, in other parts of the programming line up is more profitable for the cable operators there than it is on distant signals.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to introduce as Exhibit 18-X pages from the Factbook, you are familiar with the Factbook, are you not, Mr. Myhren?

(Whereupon, the document referred to was marked for identification as Program

NEAL R. GROSS

1	think it is the same, and I will ask you this question
2	
3	A Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Mr. Lane?
5	MR. LANE: Sorry.
6	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: I am looking for a
7	convenient time to break. I think you are going to
8	get into a long line of questioning here.
9	Let's take a 10 minute recess.
10	(Whereupon, a 10 minute recess was taken
11	at 10:50 a.m.)
12	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay, Mr. Lane, you
13	may continue.
14	CROSS EXAMINATION CONTINUED
15	BY MR. LANE
15 16	BY MR. LANE Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at
16	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at
16 17	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at program suppliers' exhibit 18-x which was copies of
16 17 18	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at program suppliers' exhibit 18-x which was copies of pages from the 1991 Fact Book.
16 17 18	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at program suppliers' exhibit 18-x which was copies of pages from the 1991 Fact Book. A Yes.
16 17 18 19	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at program suppliers' exhibit 18-x which was copies of pages from the 1991 Fact Book. A Yes. Q And I just wanted to draw your attention
16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at program suppliers' exhibit 18-x which was copies of pages from the 1991 Fact Book. A Yes. Q And I just wanted to draw your attention first to Fall River which appears on the second page
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at program suppliers' exhibit 18-x which was copies of pages from the 1991 Fact Book. A Yes. Q And I just wanted to draw your attention first to Fall River which appears on the second page which is identified as page A-707.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Thank you, Mr. Myhren. We are looking at program suppliers' exhibit 18-x which was copies of pages from the 1991 Fact Book. A Yes. Q And I just wanted to draw your attention first to Fall River which appears on the second page which is identified as page A-707. Do you have that in front of you sir?

1	WGN, does it?
2	A No, I think we established that. It does
3	not.
4	Q It also lists, does it not, under Pay
5	Service # 4, in the right hand column, New England
6	Sports Network. Do you see that?
7	A I do see that.
8	Q And then right below that on Pay Service
9	# 6, Sports Channel, New England. Do you see that?
10	A Yes.
11	Q If I look through the other ones, are you
12	aware that those two services also appear on all your
13	other New England cable systems?
14	A Which two? The Sports Channel and
15	Q The New England.
16	A And the New England Sports. Correct.
17	Q Could you tell us what those are?
18	A. Those are pay television services that
19	have sports on them.
20	Q And what kind of sports do they have on
21	them, what teams?
22	A Oh, it has varied a bit over time as
23	contracts have run in and out. But certain games of
24	college and professional teams.
25	Q What professional teams?

I can't tell you precisely what during Α 1 that period of 1990-1992. 2 I mean I can't remember precisely. 3 Were the Red Sox on either of these during 4 1990-1992? 5 The Red Sox might have had some games on Α 6 7 here. (PAUSE) 8 This morning, I think that you said, but 9 I'll give you a chance to correct you if I am wrong, 10 that you wanted to leave syndicated series and movies 11 to the pay services because you could get more 12 revenues from that. Was I correct in my understanding 13 of what you said? 14 I said that in effect -- well, first I 15 corrected that on syndicated because I said it was 16 unlikely that the syndicated series would end up on a 17 pay service because they wouldn't be bought by the 18 I think I did say that. consumer. 19 But with regard to movies, that would be 20 the ideal world, where all the movies would be up at 21 the pay level. 22 The reason that you would prefer that on 23 pay, as I understand it, is basically you would get 24 25 more money.

1	A Correct.
2	Q Would the same thing apply to the New
3	England Sports Network and Sports Channel, that you
4	would get more money the more subscribers that took
5	those pay services for sports?
6	A Well, certainly we like to have sports on
7	pay television. But there's a difference between
8	sports and movies in that each sports event is an
9	unique event. So, that you bring us back to the
10	context that we are talking in which is the distant
11	signal context. In that one, there is a certain
12	amount of sports and that sports is unique and it is
13	perishable.
14	And because of that, that translation that
15	I make with movies doesn't really apply.
16	Q In your testimony, you talked about, did
17	you not, on page 3, the programming lineup for the
18	whole system? Right?
19	A On page three?
20	Q Right, at the bottom.
21	A I remember you asking about that earlier.
22	What we as you and I defined it there is it the
23	bottom of the page?
24	Q Yes, right under 3A.
25	A And we defined it as the programming

1	lineup which is paste and expanding basie, but not
2	including pay.
3	Q Did Colony also have some systems in New
4	York State during the period, 1990-1992?
5	A It did.
6	Q I'm going to show the Witness several
7	pages of printout similar to what was in 17-x, but
8	these are for the New York system and Colony, and that
9	it be marked for identification as 19-x and moved into
10	evidence some time.
11	(Whereupon, the above referred-
12	to document was marked as
13	Program Suppliers' Exhibit 19-x
14	for identification.)
15	MR. GERSCH: Dennis, I just wanted to be
16	clear on this. You are going to move it into evidence
17	at some point, but not now?
18	MR. LANE: I'll move it now. I thought
19	after the Witness had a chance to review it, could
20	indicate these were the New York stations, New York
21	systems. I would move it at that point.
22	Q Are these the New York systems that were
23	owned by Colony during the period 1990-1992?
24	A I'm trying Dennis, I'm trying to
25	remember whether these are all of the systems.
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	Certainly these communities we had cable in these
2	communities.
3	Q If you look at the bottom of the page,
4	you'll see that it has the other communities listed.
5	This is just what's called the principal community at
6	the copyright office.
7	A Okay.
8	Q Does that help you sir?
9	A Yes, that does help. That does help.
10	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: I noticed that these
11	pages are each dated December 8, 1995. Is it your
12	testimony, sir that the Colony ownership of stations
13	in New York state was the same in the period of 1990-
14	1992 as it was in 1995?
15	THE WITNESS: Well, by the time we get to
16	December 8, 1995, Judge, we don't own these systems;
17	Continental does. But that was only true as of
18	October 5, 1995 which was the closing of our deal with
19	Continental.
20	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Are you saying that
21	in other respects you see a difference between this
22	data and what your 1992 ownership was?
23	THE WITNESS: What I'm saying is that I
24	think we did own these systems in the 1990-1992
25	period.
	NEAL R. GROSS

MR. LANE: Judge Wertheim, if you look at the left hand column under accounting period that starting with 1979-1 we have each six month period listed from the statements of account, on this page.

While the page comes with a summary of the entire experience at the copyright office of this system, I'm only focusing on the years 1990-1992.

MR. GERSCH: I believe that the December 8, 1995 figure in the upper left hand corner is the date that the computer generated.

MR. LANE: Yes, exactly.

MR. GERSCH: That's what I've heard.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: All right, everyone is agreed on that.

MR. LANE: Yeah, that was -- in earlier testimony we had some of the similar Cable Data Corporation printouts. I think the lawyers are pretty used to using that as the date it was generated, not the date when the things were filed.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Maybe this is a good point for me to note that, I'm sure many of you have noticed that we ask a lot of questions that seem naive to those knowledgeable about the industry, with the hope that those questions will decrease as we continue this process over the months.

NEAL R. GROSS

Those of you who are presenting your cases earlier in the proceedings should not assume that you are disadvantaged by having us hear you at our beginning stage. We are all agreed that we are not going to reach any conclusions until we have heard all of the evidence from everybody.

(PAUSE)

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Is there a question pending, Mr. Lane.

MR. LANE: No, I -- the witness is looking through it and I just thought I would give him the chance to complete that before I started, if that's agreeable with you?

THE WITNESS: If my bifocals hold up here,

I'll be all right.

Q Have you had a chance to look through these pages in exhibit 19-x?

A Yes.

Q And do these pages comport with your understanding of what the cable systems in New York owned by Colony in the 1990-1992 period was?

A I'll be perfectly honest with you, I can't remember these systems that closely, if you are talking about the carriage.

O I'm just talking about that these were

NEAL R. GROSS

your systems.

A Oh, as best as I can tell in looking at this list at the bottom of the page where we list all the communities, if those communities are subsumed in these community names at the top of the page, properly, then my guess is that this is correct.

Q Now, in looking at the call signs for the period 1990-1992, were any of the super stations listed as being carried in those years?

A I don't see any of them.

Q So, they were not listed as being carried?

A Well, what we have here, Dennis, is a somewhat unique situation in that we have what really amounts to what could be called distant sports that are being carried on local signals, in effect. These are relatively rural communities where they would have trouble getting off-air, these things.

What you've got is WPIX and WWOR are being delivered on the cable system with the sports there which saves the cable system a reasonable amount of money. It is not as important to be paying the copyright fees to buy some additional distant signals.

Q But WPIX and WWOR were considered local signals in the 1990-1992 period?

A For the rules, apparently so.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Q And, for whatever reasons, these systems
2	did not see fit to carry any other super stations?
3	A That is correct.
4	It may have been determined locally here
5	that people didn't move in and out of these
6	communities a lot and didn't have quite the interest
7	that you generally find in out-of-area teams.
8	So, that could be part of the reason here.
9	I mean, I think that Rip Van Winkle grew up near here.
10	Q Do you know whether these systems carried
11	any regional sports networks during that period?
12	A I'm not sure. They might well have had
13	what has been called variously the Madison Square
14	Garden channel, might well have been brought up in
15	these communities.
16	But I'm sure you are going to tell me.
17	Q I always like to be helpful to my
18	witnesses on Cross.
19	MR. LANE: I'd like to introduce as
20	exhibit number 20-x, some pages from the black book
21	similar to what we have previously seen in exhibit 18-
22	x.
23	(Whereupon, the above referred-
24	to document was marked as the
25	Program Suppliers' exhibit 20-x
- 1	

1	for identification)
2	Q And these, are they not, Mr. Myhren, my
3	first question will be, are the ones related to the
4	New York systems we just discussed?
5	A I should be looking for arrows here,
6	right?
7	Q I hope so.
8	A I'm not finding any.
9	Q All right. Beacon is the first on, is it
10	not, on the first page?
11	A Beacon. Okay. So we should circle that
12	one, okay.
13	Q Put a little arrow.
14	The next page it's at the far right hand
15	bottom of the right hand column, Fishkill. And then
16	it just carries over to the next page.
17	On page A-1059, it's Hyde Park in the
18	second column. Do you see that?
19	A Yes.
20	Q On page A-1063, in the left hand column,
21	it's Lloyd.
22	On the next page, A-1067, it's Monroe.
23	A Yes.
24	Q And on the next two pages, A-1088 it's
25	Wappinger; it's way down on the right hand corner and

1	then it carries over to the next page.
2	Do you see that?
3	A Yes, I do.
4	Q And these are the same systems that we
5	just discussed on exhibit 19-x, are they not?
6	A I'm trying to figure this out because they
7	don't seem to be lined up precisely the same way, are
8	they?
9	Q They are not lined up precisely.
10	A They are not.
11	Q There is apparently slightly different
12	definitions, but I think that if you looked at all of
13	the communities you would find that they were.
14	A That, by the way, not having spent a lot
15	of time with this kind of sheet, which I guess can be
16	inaccurate at times, I would guess it is probably
17	mostly accurate.
18	I have spent a lot of time with these
19	types of sheets and there a bunch of different sources
20	and they sometimes get a little bit confused.
21	Q Right.
22	A With that as a qualification, I would say
23	let's go into this.
24	Q Well, we could look at the end of each of
25	these entries, could we not, and see that the
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	ownership was Colony Communications, Inc. as we see on
2	the first page for Beacon?
3	A Right. I see that.
4	Q We could go through that, if you would
5	like?
6	A In what
7	Q Well, then we could go to Fishkill and
8	look at the back of that and see that Colony
9	Communications is listed as the ownership on the third
10	page, top of the second column.
11	A Sure. I'm assuming I just have to try
12	to figure out which of the communities are inn each of
13	the groupings that they have here.
14	Q I'm not going to try -
15	A But that's not
16	Q I'm not going to try to match them
17	precisely, if that saves you some anxiety.
18	A Okay.
19	Q If I look at this, just sticking with
20	Beacon to start off with, there are no super stations
21	listed as being carried in Beacon, are there, on
22	exhibit 20-x? As distant signals.
23	A No. They are sort of what I might call
ı	1
24	foreign stations that have sports but no distant

1	Q Right. For royalty purposes.
2	A For royalty purposes, correct.
3	Q And that, you are referring to I take it,
4	WPIX and WWOR.
5	A And WWOR, right.
6	Q And as we established, these are both
7	local stations in these communities.
8	A Right.
9	Q I also see, if sticking with Beacon on the
10	first page of exhibit of 20-x, you see there is an
11	expanded basic one service listed there in the right
12	hand column, about a quarter of the way down the
13	column?
14	A Right. I do see that.
15	Q And you see Madison Square Garden Network
16	listed there?
17	A Yes. That was the one that I mentioned
18	earlier, I thought was carried.
19	Q You were referring to that?
20	A Right.
21	Q Is it your understanding that that is a
22	channel that offers sports programming?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Do you know what kind of sports program
25	they offer?

1	A They have some games and they have some
2	commentary and interview shows, you know, things of
3	that type.
4	Q And by games, do you include live
5	professional sports events?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And you see, just a little further down
8	the column from that, in Pay Service # 5, Sports
9	Channel, New York?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And to your knowledge, is that a channel
12	on which you can receive live sports events?
13	A I believe it is.
14	Q And we go to the third
15	A I think for the Panel's understanding, by
16	the way, on these, which are pay services, they are
17	not basic or expanded services. The fare on these
18	type of services changes as you go over the years, as
19	contracts with various sports teams come in and go
20	out, so that there is some variability on this.
21	But, generally, there are some games on
22	this.
23	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Is this a regular
24	occurrence, Mr. Myhren?
25	THE WITNESS: You mean that contracts

1||

change?

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: No, no. Where you have local stations carrying sports in lieu of the super station?

THE WITNESS: The super station.

If you go around the country -- we are talking about very small markets here, okay?

If you go into most major markets in the country, the broadcasters in that market -- somebody will have some sports packages, often of their own teams, teams from that area. That's fairly typical.

This is a bit of a strange duck in that -You know, as you get up into New York State, going
away from New York City, you get up into places where
there are huge hills and valleys and reception really
isn't' very good.

So, even thought you might define a New York station as local, it is something that a lot of people can't receive unless they have cable. Because cable will pull that thing off the air and get it to everybody in the hills and valleys.

And that is real good from a cable operator's perspective because he's receiving a local channel which has these sports from New York city and he's giving it to these folks. And he doesn't have to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	FCC rules, to the extent that you have an
2	understanding?
3	A I think 35 miles well, it's been
4	changed a couple of times.
5	Q Right.
6	A As you know. And we have to take
7	ourselves back to the 1990-1992 period and then I'll
8	ask precisely what was it in the 1990-1992 period,
9	because it has changed.
10	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: The significance of
11	it is that you don't know.
12	THE WITNESS: Well, I recognize that.
13	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Well, whether it is
14	local or not is defined by FCC rules.
15	THE WITNESS: Is defined by FCC rules.
16	And what is important here
17	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: So, it's not
18	necessarily the same as copyright rules?
19	MR. LANE: Could I just interject a
20	question?
21	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Feel free to
22	clarify.
23	MR. LANE: Okay.
24	Q If, assuming that exhibit 19-x is correct,
25	that it was identified as a local
	MEAL D. CDOSS

1	A A local signal.
2	Q That means for royalty purposes, you paid
3	not royalties?
4	A That is correct. We paid no royalties.
5	Q And presumably you made that or some made
6	that decision based on their interpretation that the
7	
8	A Of the rules.
9	Q FCC rules, as applied to the copyright
10	payment, define this as local, and therefore there was
11	not reason to make payment.
12	A Right. Because there was a tie between
13	the FCC rules and the copyright payment, exactly.
14	So, it was defined in this case as local.
15	And it goes a long way to explaining why there were
16	not distant signals bought by these cable systems.
17	Because they had some distant sports.
18	What, for most of their subscribers were
19	sports that the people couldn't get off the air, that
20	they could import for them. And they had the
21	advantage, in this particular case, of not paying for
22	them because of the way the rules work and because of
23	the strange topography of this area.
24	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Now, is this
25	decision made in a coordinated effort by officials of
	NEAL R. GROSS

your company?

Whether they carry, for example, distant signals or carry these local stations in lieu of the distant signals.

THE WITNESS: The way that works in our company -- or worked in our company and in my previous company and works for most cable companies, is that people at the headquarters level weigh-in with certain opinions on these things.

But the people at the individual system level who are responsible for the P&L of that system and have to recognize what the appeals of the various things are and what the cost is going to bring that appeal, make that decision, typically, in the end.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Now, do they base their decision also on surveys that are made in-house, locally, by the in-house?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: You do make your own surveys?

THE WITNESS: People do their own surveys.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: So, at the local level and also at the headquarters level, you make your own surveys?

THE WITNESS: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Let me say, Judge, that some systems make more surveys than others. I mean this is not something that is done But there are local surveys done, often, by cable systems, and there are surveys that are done about appeals and viewer preferences and so on, that ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: But the trust -THE WITNESS: The decision usually ends up down at the individual cable system level. ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: But the thrust in all of this is to increase your cash flow? THE WITNESS: The thrust in the end is to Thank you. I should say in defense of the honor of it all that you make more money when you appeal to more subscribers and treat them right. But in fact, what

NEAL R. GROSS

1	17-x, which is the comments of the Commissioner of
2	Baseball?
3	A Was that the first one you handed out?
4	Q It was the second one.
5	A Somehow I oh, wait; I've got it.
6	Q You have it?
7	Now, Judge Farmakides just asked you a
8	question about the availability of sports programs
9	locally, and putting aside the years that are
10	involved, would this list be all the stations to your
11	understanding that carry
12	Let's just turn to the first page, the
13	Boston Red Sox in addition to WSBK, WBBG in
14	Springfield, Massachusetts carried Red Sox games.
15	WLNE, New Bedford carried, et cetera, going on down
16	the list.
17	A Your saying do I know that in 1990-1992 or
18	1994 this is true? This is a 1994 report.
19	Q I'm not asking you about the date.
20	A Okay.
21	Q I'm asking you if you are aware that
22	baseball clubs do have what is termed here as regional
23	television networks?
24	A Yes, I am aware of that.
25	Q And if this is an accurate representation

1	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: So, your objection
2	to it is that it contains more information than the
3	Witness is able to support?
4	MR. MIDLEN: Exactly.
5	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: And that's both the
6	16 and the 19?
7	MR. MIDLEN: Exactly.
8	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Any response to
9	that, Mr. Gersch?
10	MR. LANE: No, they are my exhibits, sir.
11	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Forgive me. Sorry,
12	Mr. Lane.
13	MR. LANE: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: That was the problem
15	the other day. We kept referring to somebody as your
16	witness and it wasn't your witness.
17	MR. LANE: They are not my witnesses, but
18	they are my exhibits.
19	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay, very good.
20	MR. LANE: I think the Witness testified,
21	generally, about the size of the systems. I'm not
22	particularly interested in those. I was more
23	interested in the questioning focused on the extent of
24	the carriage to which the Witness did answer all the
25	questions.

and

However,

amount

If you would like to strike the rate, 1 subs, gross receipts and royalty columns, I wouldn't 2 I think that would solve have a problem with that. 3 Mr. Midlen's objections. 4 (PAUSE) 5 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Counsel, you have no 6 objection to the exhibit? Do you have objections to . 7 the exhibit as modified by Mr. Lane, in reference to 8 subs, royalties rates, striking out 9 10 receipts? Well, Your Honor, I think MR. MIDLEN: 11 that covers a great deal of my objection. 12 а substantial left still there is 13 information in the exhibit to which the Witness did 14 not testify. 15 For example, looking at 16-x. 16 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: That he did not 17 testify or he was not able to --18 That he did not address in MR. MIDLEN: 19 his testimony. 20 For example, looking at 16-x --21 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Are you suggesting 22 then, are we talking now, about sponsoring? Are you 23 saying that he can't sponsor some of this testimony, 24 is that it? 25

MR. MIDLEN: The Witness was not the sponsor of this, was not properly the sponsor of this exhibit. The total exhibit is labeled as having been compiled by Cable Data Corporation, by Thomas Larson. And Mr. Larson is not here to support this exhibit.

This witness has identified certain aspects of the information in the exhibit.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: So that I understand you, the nature of your objection is what?

MR. MIDLEN: That the exhibit does not have a proper sponsoring witness, and that this Witness, the witness that is on the stand, has not, in any way, shape or form qualified as able to sponsor the exhibit.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: All right. On that specific issue.

Mr. Lane?

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Witness if these were if these were indeed the Colony systems and he indicated that they were in the period 1990-1992.

I asked him and you recall he spent a considerable amount of time looking through the stations, indicated that they were indeed the stations that were carried and we had several questions on

The Witness was able to answer all those that. 1 questions clearly. 2 He could sponsor the indications. Whether 3 he did this or not, we have also used, as you know, a 4 lot of Cable Data Corporation information in these 5 It's just a very short hand way of us doing 6 7 that. But more important, I believe that the 8 Witness was able to answer all my questions concerning 9 these two exhibits about the carriage. 10 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: To be fair, Counsel? 11 agree with Mr. Ι MIDLEN: MR. 12 completely. He answered some questions about some of 13 the information in these exhibits. And that is 14 testimony; it is in the record. We don't object to 15 16 that. But, for example, just looking at page 17 one, of 16-x, we didn't touch on station WGBX at all. 18 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: So, your contention 19 still is that he is not a sponsoring witness. 20 MR. MIDLEN: We looked at WWOR, WPIX. 21 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Counsel, excuse me. 22 You made your argument, we heard your argument. 23 Any other comments concerning this? 24 (PAUSE) 25

NEAL R. GROSS

1	objection?
2	MR. GERSCH: The basis is that this
3	reflects the 1994 carriage. The Witness was unable to
4	determine whether this would be typical of 1992.
5	In addition, it's an incomplete exhibit.
6	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Counsel, your
7	response?
8	MR. LANE: First of all, I thought since
9	we had introduced I can't remember now. I think we
10	had introduced another part of these comments and I
11	thought that the sports claimants were going to
12	introduce the whole thing.
13	I recognize this is 1994. I think this
14	exhibit was introduced more for the purpose of showing
15	that there are regional sports television networks.
16	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: If you have that in
17	testimony, what do you need the exhibit for?
18	MR. LANE: All right, fine. I'll withdraw
19	the exhibit 17.
20	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Withdrawn.
21	MR. GERSCH: Mr. Chairman, if I could just
22	note that the prior effort to admit the comments was
23	withdrawn and it is not in evidence.
24	So, the comments of the Commissioner are
25	not in evidence.

1	MR. LANE: I knew they would be keeping
2	track of my exhibits.
3	(LAUGHTER)
4	MR. GERSCH: That's my job.
5	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Number 18? You are
6	moving that?
7	MR. LANE: I'm moving 18.
8	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Any objections?
9	Hearing no objections, that will be
10	admitted.
11	(Whereupon, the above referred-
12	to document was admitted as
13	Program Suppliers' Exhibit
14	number 18-x.)
15	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Number 19? I think
16	that is the same as number 16.
17	MR. MIDLEN: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: The positions of the
19	parties are the same?
20	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: You are making the
21	same modification there, Mr. Lane?
22	MR. LANE: Yes, sir.
23	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: It will be admitted
23 24	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: It will be admitted as modified.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	to document was admitted as
2	Program Suppliers' Exhibit
3	number 19-x.)
4	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: And number 20. Any
5	objection to number 20?
6	Hearing no objections, it will be
7	admitted.
8	(Whereupon, the above referred-
9	to document was admitted as
10	Program Suppliers' Exhibit
11	number 20-x.)
12	MR. GERSCH: No objections.
13	MR. LANE: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: The next cross
15	examiner for Mr. Myhren?
16	MR. HESTER: I do have something. I
17	discussed with counsel the order we would go in.
18	CROSS EXAMINATION
19	BY: MR. HESTER
20	Q Good morning. My name is Timothy Hester.
21	I represent the public television claimants.
22	I wanted first, if I could, to refer your
23	attention back to Program Suppliers' exhibit 18-x.
24	And if I could direct your attention specifically to
25	the reference on the second page to the Fall River
	NEAL D. ODOOO

	١	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17	·	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

Do you see in the first paragraph under Fall River there is an entry, Channel Capacity:, and then it refers to 40 channels. Is that the way you read that?

A That's the way I read it, yes.

Q And it says 'channels available, but not in use: none'. Do you see that?

A I do.

system.

Q Is that your recollection of the circumstances during that period?

A I think during that period that was largely true.

Q And if I could --

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Excuse me. I don't know if you are the right witness to ask this at this time, but what is it that determines the capacity?

I see on this one page we have Fall River with 40, we have Fair Haven with 52, we have East Hampton with 35.

What accounts for these variations?

THE WITNESS: It's the electronics of the cable system. A cable system is made up of -- it starts in the head end where all the signals are brought down and then transmitted over the cable.

NEAL R. GROSS

24

25

somewhat

the

has

capacity

1	channels available but not in use, is that right?
2	A Right.
3	Q Is that your recollection?
4	A I can't remember that, precisely.
5	I typically found with cable systems that
6	when there is some controversy over carriage of a
7	particular channel, or addition of a few channels, for
8	me to get up to speed, I always have to say to our
9	engineers, remind me of what the electronics of that
10	system are and what we can do with it.
11	So, to remember back to what it was like
12	in that system in 1990-1992, I just don't remember.
13	Q Do you have any reason to doubt the
14	reference here?
15	A They might well be right. My only reason
16	for doubt was the one that I expressed earlier to
17	Dennis which is that there are a lot of books like
18	this and sometimes they get it right and sometimes
19	they don't.
20	Q Let me ask you to look further back to the
21	Westerly system which is listed on the next to the
22	last page of the exhibit.
23	There is a reference here to a channel
24	capacity of 40. Do you see that?
25	A Yes, I do.

Sure.

A In fact, I can't imagine a situation and I have never heard of one, in which a cable operator, where, for example a reasonable amount of sports on a distant signal, would not have opted to carry it.

But the operator is constrained by two things: One is the channel capacity and the other is, what is the cost? Because it always adds value. It's just a question whether, in this particular case, can I get it on the system, and then the next one is how much does it cost to put it on?

Q And the significance of the channel capacity point is that when the operator decides to bring in a distant signal, it's forgoing other programming opportunities? Is that right? Is that the significance of the channel capacity?

A Oh, yes. Absolutely. It is really a choice among a broad array of possibilities which are distant signals. All kinds of cable channels that are available if you chose to carry them which has nothing to do with distant signals that are being broadcasted.

They are just things that you can bring down by satellite because they are put up there by someone who has created a new cable channel and wants you to carry it.

There are vastly more channels to day than there were in the 1990-1992 period than there was channel capacity to carry.

Now, I wanted to ask you to imagine for a moment, a cable system that didn't have available a local public television signal.

A Okay.

Q So, the only way it could carry a public television signal is by a distant signal.

A Okay.

Q In that circumstance, would you agree with me that that distant public television signal is quite important to that cable operator.

A We might not agree on the exact level of importance, but I would say it is important if you don't have public television on a system, to put some on.

Q And why would you say that's true?

A Because, it once again goes to this issue that I think is at the core of the programming decision made by the cable person, which is, I want to offer each niche -- I want every niche covered.

And if I don't have every niche covered, that's where I get into a problem in not appealing to a certain part of the community that I want to appeal

NEAL R. GROSS

to.

1.3

Now, they are not going to be cable subscribers. I haven't quite given them the thing that they are most interested in.

It is sort of the reason why this profusion of movie and syndicated programming which is available lots of places on the cable programming lineup; you just don't need more of that. You've already got that. Covered that base.

If, in that same situation, I don't have public television at all, then I better have some. It really goes to the mechanism by which the cable operator makes his decision so that he can gain subscribers.

Q And I take it, part of the point that you are making here is that as to public television, there is a certain kind of programming on public television that you can't find anywhere else. So the cable operator needs to have some?

A Well, I think that is a judgement that has to be made and it changes as the years go by. But, there is Arts and Entertainment now. There are various people, there's a history channel. There are certain things on CNN, certain discussions that are much like what you might find on PBS.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	So that niche that PBS had is obviously
2	being eroded. But I still think there is a niche.
3	Q And let me ask you specifically during the
4	1990-1992 period do you recall if that was the time
5	frame when PBS broadcast the Civil War series produced
6	by Ken Burns?
7	Do you recall that?
8	A Sure.
9	Q And do you recall
10	A I didn't realize that that was the precise
11	time, but I do remember the series.
12	Q I'll tell you it was during 1990.
13	A Okay.
14	Q And on that representation, well actually,
15	I should amend that. Actually, I believe it was in
16	1991.
17	The Civil War was a series that was not
18	available anywhere else on television, is that right?
19	A At that point, it was not.
20	Q So, for those viewers that wanted
21	A Not the Ken Burns Civil War was not
22	available.
23	Q Right. For those viewers that wanted to
24	see the Civil War series, that was the only place that
25	they would have been able to see it, on public

1	television.
2	A Yes.
3	Q This goes back to your discussion of
4	sports before. There are certain sporting events that
5	the viewer can only see by watching a given channel,
6	is that right?
7	A Yeah. I think that what you point out is
8	the similarity in the what I consider the rational
9	process of the cable operator in valuing these things
10	there.
11	The difference that I would point out, is
12	that with the sports event, you'll never get a chance
13	to see that one again.
14	Q Right.
15	A Okay. Where it means anything to you.
16	Q Right.
17	A With the Ken Burns series, you will get a
18	chance to see it again.
19	So, to that extent, there is a difference
20	here.
21	But to the extent that there was no other
22	place to get this and it hadn't been shown anywhere
23	else before, okay? I buy your point on that one.
24	Q Is it also your experience that families
25	with children are a particularly important source of

	Caple subscribers:
2	A Yes, they are.
3	Q And is there significant children's
4	programming on PBS that can be of value to families
5	with children?
6	A Certainly PBS has developed, over the
7	years, some children's programming. I happen to be a
8	believer that what Nickelodeon has done, for example,
9	is outstanding.
10	That's on cable also and if you have
11	Nickelodeon, the programming on PBS is not quite as
12	important.
13	You also know that cable's own programming
14	that is generated on its own and its various channels
15	has won a lot of awards for children's programming.
16	So, the PBS programming is not unique in that sense,
17	but I would say that PBS has a reputation among folks
18	for children's programming.
19	Q And the Nickelodeon programming you are
20	thinking of would not be oriented toward the youngest
21	of children, is that right?
22	A To the youngest, that's right.
23	Q And PBS has developed Sesame Street and
24	other programming that isn't available elsewhere for
25	very young children. Is that right?
-	NEAL B. GROSS

1	A Yes.
2	Q I won't ask you to vouch for the purple
3	dinosaur, but you recall that Barney was a series
4	developed during the years 1990-1992.
5	A I don't remember the precise timing, once
6	again, but I do remember Barney.
7	Q That was a program of particular interest
8	to families with small children, I take it.
9	A I think that most people would say that
10	Barney was good children's programming.
11	Q Let me ask you to turn, if you could, to
12	Program Suppliers' exhibit 16-x. It is the Cable Data
13	printout.
14	I would like to direct your attention to
15	the last page which deals with the Westerly cable
16	system.
17	Do you see that page?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Tell me where Westerly is located. I take
20	it, it is located in Rhode Island?
21	A It's in Rhode Island, right almost on the
22	Connecticut border. So it is just east of
23	Connecticut. You know the Connecticut and Rhode
24	Island runs east to west instead of north to south.
25	Q And Westerly was the system that you
	NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	being carried by this system on a local basis?
2	A I'm trying to find oh, okay. I finally
3	found.
4	Q One of them is WEDN, is that right?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And the other one that was carried on a
7	local basis was WSBE?
8	A Right, I see them both.
9	Q So, this is a cable system that had
10	decided to carry two distant public television signals
11	as well as two locals, is that right?
12	A I think what is evident is that it got rid
13	of WFXT before the period we are talking about here.
14	No, no, sorry. These columns are hard to
15	read.
16	Q Yes. Well, maybe we should just make sure
17	we working through.
18	A Right, WFXT is carried and then dropped in
19	1994.
20	Q But during the period of 1990-1992?
21	A During the period we are talking about it
22	is still there.
23	Q And during the period 1990-1992, WGBH was
24	carried as a distant signal as well?
25	A Right.
- 1	NEW D ODGGG

But at that time, there were four because the -- not the community of viewers, but the City That's the way I remember that. Excuse me, just a It appears, just looking at 16-x and 18-x NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	hour.
2	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: At this time we will
3	take a break for lunch.
4	(Whereupon, the proceedings recessed at
5	12:11 p.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

we

lunch

were

an

But -- but the question was, how does one get down to two for the system management who desperately wanted to get down to two. But they -- they -- they ran into some flack from the City Council on that. Now eventually, obviously, over time they reduced the carriage on the -- on the third, and I -- as I remember it, that was sort of a back and forth from the City Council about what makes sense, because there was a lot of duplication on the educational side.

Q Well, even today, the system is carrying WGBH and at least a part of its --

- A A portion, yeah.
- Q A portion.

A Yeah, I think what they did was to reduce that carriage and -- and possibly to those things that are unique at WGBH. As I remember it, WGBH, which comes out of Boston, is -- is the source of about 40 percent of all of the original programming on PBS nationally coming out of the PBS system. So it is, arguably, the strongest PBS station in the country, so it's a somewhat unique situation.

Q And so your point is that WGBH could be an attractive distant signal as a source of PBS programming?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	A Yeah.
2	Q And
3	A If I were to choose a PBS station in the
4	country, you know, if you went all around the entire
5	country, I'd probably choose WGBH as the number one
6	PBS station.
7	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Could you explain
8	how they came to carry WGBH partially, in view of the
9	at least it may be a defect in my understanding,
10	but my understanding is you either carry a channel or
11	you don't. You can't say we'll carry this part of it
12	but not the other part. Is there an exception for the
13	educational channels?
14	THE WITNESS: You
15	BY MR. HESTER:
16	Q Can I help you out with the question and
17	see if I can
18	A Yeah, go ahead.
19	Q your memory, and see if this accords
20	with your recollection.
21	This Westerly cable system encompasses a
22	number of different communities, is that right?
23	A Right.
24	Q And does the designation of a partial
25	distant signal mean that the distant signal is being
1	NEAL R. GROSS

carried in some of those communities but perhaps not 1 in all of those covered by the system? 2 I'm not sure what this --That could be. 3 what the partial carriage, I think it was the "X" on 4 here, in --5 6 0 Yes. What that means in this cable data 7 А rundown, as to whether it's part of the day for -- in 8 a multi-community system, only in some of those 9 if Ι Ιf Ι remember ___ communities. 10 correctly, the agreement that was -- was reached with 11 the City Council members was that part of the day 12 would actually be carried on this, and I think that 13 was with WGBH's agreement. 14 So it may be that there are ways to take 15 the general rules here and change them. If you went 16 to Ted Turner and said, "I want to do this with WTBS," 17 or you went to Tribune and said, "I want to chop up 18 WGN," they would say no. I think in this particular 19 case there was a yes. That's my -- my memory, but 20 I've got to tell you I'm a little bit unclear on that. 21 So you don't remember specifically? 22 Q can't remember precisely. 23 remember that we had a channel capacity problem. 24 There were a lot of PBS's on. The management of the 25

1	system said, "This doesn't make any sense, because
2	what we're doing is getting just too much of the same.
3	Let's get let's drop some PBS's." The City Council
4	said, "You can't drop WGBH."
5	Q Did the management, to your recollection,
6	want two PBS signals?
7	A The preference, typically, on cable system
8	management is to have one.
9	Q And are there
10	A Given that there are a finite number of
11	channels they would like to have one PBS channel.
12	Q Are there also occasions when cable
13	systems carry one local and one distant signal PBS?
14	A That sometimes happens, sometimes happens.
15	Q And can that occur, for instance, in
16	circumstances where the local public television signal
17	has a different programming mix from the one that's
18	being imported on a distant basis?
19	A That would make it more sensible to do.
20	Q And are you aware of some occasions when
21	that has, in fact, happened in that way?
22	A I'm not I don't have things spring to
23	mind right now. I I know that it has happened that
24	way, yes.
25	Q Let me ask you, if you could, to look at

1	Program Suppliers Exhibit 19-X.
2	A Which one is it, because I didn't
3	Q That's the other one of these printouts.
4	A That's a New York system?
5	Q Yes, the New York system.
6	A All right.
7	Q And I wanted to direct your attention to
8	the page on Hyde Park.
9	A Okay.
10	Q Do you have that page?
11	A Yes, I do.
12	Q Now, this table up at the top again has
13	the designations for the different kinds of distant
14	signals. Do you see that?
15	A Yes, I do.
16	Q I think we can agree that there is one
17	error here. There is a listing for WNBC. That would
18	not be an educational station, would it?
19	A No, it sure wouldn't.
20	Q I could represent for the panel that
21	Mr. Lane and I had conferred off the record and
22	concluded that that must be a mistake. That's
23	obviously a network.
24	A That's the NBC affiliate from New York
25	City.

1	Q So that should properly be changed to an
2	"N" I take it.
3	A Right.
4	Q Now, and do you see that there are two
5	other educational
6	A I do.
7	Q And one is shown as a local signal, and
8	one is shown as a distant signal during the period '90
9	through '92, is that right?
10	A That's correct.
11	Q And to your recollection, was the Hyde
12	Park system operating at full channel capacity during
13	this period?
14	A I I can't remember, but I'm going to
15	guess that it was.
16	Q I can just help you out with that one, I
17	hope, if I direct you to Program Suppliers Exhibit 20-
18	X.
19	A That's to the extent that, once again,
20	that I that Program Suppliers exhibit is accurate,
21	because as I stated previously these are often
22	inaccurate.
23	Q Right.
24	A But I I these systems were older
25	systems. They had lesser channel capacity. I'm going
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	to guess that they were upgraded to full capacity.
2	Q Okay. So that would be your general
3	recollection as to this Hyde Park system?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Okay.
6	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: They don't move Hyde
7	Park back and forth, further and inclusive to New York
8	City from year to year, do they?
9	THE WITNESS: Hyde Park?
10	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Yes.
11	THE WITNESS: I don't think so.
12	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: How come it's local
13	some years and distant other years?
14	THE WITNESS: Well, that's that's a
15	very good question. It has to do with the changes in
16	the FCC definitions of the distances you know,
17	these concentric circles that are drawn around a
18	market and how far out it is, because the city stays
19	in the same place and the concentric circles move.
20	BY MR. HESTER:
21	Q And can there also be occasions when a
22	particular household might be able to pick up a signal
23	over the air with rabbit ears on their television
24	antenna, yet that signal might be treated as a distant
25	signal for these purposes?

A That's possible. I mean, we really have both situations, where someone might be able to pick it up on rabbit ears, and it is treated as a distant signal, and where it is relatively close to the broadcasting transmitter and the city of origin, and yet there is a mountain in the way and they can't pick it up, and it's a local signal. I mean, so you get those kinds of anomalies.

And it's interesting, you know, as we look at the -- these situations or the cable systems here

And it's interesting, you know, as we look at the -- these situations or the cable systems here that were put into -- into -- put in as exhibits, these are a small part of our cable mix. Okay? And they represent some anomalous situations.

In the vast majority of our cable systems which are on the west coast of Florida, the east coast of Florida, southern California, northern California, Minnesota, you know, just to give you some of the spread, we have more distant signals. We carry more distant signals with these -- particularly these superstations and the -- and the big sports operations, because those markets work out a little bit differently than these -- than these do.

I don't know why these were chosen. I guess because maybe they didn't have as many distant signals, but they're just a small part of -- of what

1	we do, and they are different than the average, and I
2	would say from my experience in the average of what
3	cable systems look like, and certainly from the
4	average of Colony's system.
5	Q Thank you. Those are all the questions I
6	have.
7	A Okay. Thanks.
8	Not done yet?
9	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Somebody else wants
10	to talk to you.
11	THE WITNESS: Okay.
12	CROSS EXAMINATION
13	BY MS. HAND:
14	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Myhren. I'm
15	Jacqueline Hand on behalf of the National Association
16	of Broadcasters, and we're here claiming for the
17	station-produced programs of U.S. commercial
18	television stations.
19	A Okay.
20	Q I just have a few questions for you. The
21	first one is I believe you stated both here today and
22	in your direct testimony that Providence Journal
23	Company owns 11 broadcast television stations, is
24	A That's correct.
25	Q that correct?

1	A Yeah.
2	Q Do you know, Mr. Myhren, is KING licensed
3	to Seattle, Washington, one of those broadcast
4	stations?
5	A Yes, it is. Yes, channel 5 Seattle. It's
6	an NBC affiliate.
7	Q Do you know, Mr. Myhren, whether KING
8	produces a local evening newscast?
9	A Yes, it does.
10	Q Does it also produce a number of other
11	news programs
12	A Yes, it does.
13	Q within the station?
14	A And public affairs.
15	Q Do you know which cable systems carry KING
16	as a distant signal?
17	A I couldn't tell you precisely which ones
18	do. It's a very desirable signal.
19	Q Is it true that KING is carried by King
20	Video Cable Company to its Ellensburg, Washington,
21	system?
22	A Probably so.
23	Q Okay.
24	A Yeah.
25	Q At this time, Mr. Myhren, I'm going to
1	1

hand you a two-page exhibit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me -- let me make a point here. we talk about network affiliate stations, as opposed to the distant signals we've generally been talking about, and I'm sure that will come up somewhere in the -- in the proceedings, but just -- there really is a different -- there are some different considerations that one must go through when one brings a distant signal in which is duplicative of another signal from that same network into a -- when you come into a market where the cable operator is also -- already carrying, let's say, an NBC affiliation and now it brings this one from a distance in, the network nonduplication rules go into effect, which are not at all at play on most of the distant signals we've been talking about. Has that come up here at all?

Q What would you say that you, as a cable system operator, you would evaluate the non-network program on that distant signal? For example, you would look at the KING.

- A Yeah.
- Q Non-network programming.
- A Yeah.
- Q Okay. At this time, I'd like to hand this exhibit to you.

Okay. MS. HAND: And I'd like this to be marked for identification as NAB 1990-1992 Exhibit 2-X. 3 (Whereupon, the above-referred 4 to document was marked as NAB 5 1990-1992 Exhibit No. 2-X for 6 identification.) 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 8 MS. HAND: I'd like you to look over that. 9 Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to clarify 10 that this exhibit is a portion, an excerpt from an 11 exhibit that has been submitted as part of NAB's 12 direct case, and Dr. Ducey will be testifying later 13 this week and will be the sponsoring witness for this 14 exhibit. 15 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: What's the exhibit 16 17 number in your direct case? MS. HAND: It's Exhibit 12. 18 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Thank you. 19 BY MS. HAND: 20 Now, I know you didn't put this exhibit 21 0 together, Mr. Myhren, so you may not understand what 22 many of these notations are. If you don't mind, I'll 23 just go through quickly and explain to you what it 24 and have you accept, for purposes of my 25 NEAL R. GROSS

1

Α

questions, that it's accurate. 1 Okay. Α the distant signal This chart shows 3 0 carriage of KOMO, and on the left-hand -- along the 4 five cable listed system 5 left-hand marqin Ι communities that carry KOMO as a distant or partially 6 7 distant signal. Okay. 8 Α And underneath each community is listed 9 the other broadcast signals that are carried by that 10 system. Would you look through quickly and highlight 11 for yourself where KING is listed? 12 Well, on here it's listed in Astoria, 13 Α Oregon. 14 Right. 15 Q As a local signal. 16 Α Right. You're one step ahead of me. 17 0 Okay. 18 Α The L, the dash L represents a local 19 0 I'll just identify the dash NN is meant to 20 signal. represent network and a network affiliate of NBC. 21 Α Got you. 22 Washington, obviously the Seattle, 23 Q community of license, and dash L represents local. 24 Then to answer your question, it's 25 Α Okay. NEAL R. GROSS

1	listed as a local signal in Astoria, Oregon, and it's
2	listed as a distant signal in the next four markets
3	that you have Ellensburg, Washington, which was one
4	of our cable systems; Longview, Washington; Moses
5	Lake, Washington; and Wenatchee, Washington.
6	Q Okay. Would you turn to the second page
7	of this exhibit?
8	And again, for clarification purposes,
9	this is taken from Exhibit 12 of Dr. Ducey's
10	testimony, and he will be appearing later this week to
11	sponsor this exhibit.
12	Are those four communities you just
13	mentioned identified on this map?
14	A I see them, yes.
15	Q Okay. Mr. Myhren, I have only one
16	question relating to this map. In the cable markets
17	around Seattle, and the ones I'm referring to would be
18	Wenatchee, Moses Lake, Ellensburg, and Longview, would
19	the news programs from KING and Seattle, Washington,
20	be of value to the cable operators in Wenatchee, Moses
21	Lake, Ellensburg, and Longview, and the cable
22	subscribers of those systems?
23	A Yes.
24	MS. HAND: Okay. At this time, I'd like
25	to distribute another exhibit, which for
]	NEAL R. GROSS

identification I'd like to have marked as NAB 1990-1 1992 Exhibit 3-X. 2 (Whereupon, the above-referred 3 to document was marked as NAB 4 1990-1992 Exhibit No. 3-X for 5 identification.) 6 BY MS. HAND: 7 And I only have one copy of this, but I'd 8 like to hand it to the witness, with a complete copy 9 of the transcript that these pages are excerpted from. 10 And if you'd like to refer to this at any time, I just 11 want you to have that available. 12 Now, you testified earlier, didn't you, 13 Mr. Myhren, that King Video Cable Company is a cable 14 system owned by Providence Journal, is that right? 15 It was owned until we made the sale to Α 16 Continental. 17 This past October? 18 Q Very recent, right. 19 Α Okay. Are you aware that Edward Hewson, 20 Q the Regional Manager for King Video Cable, testified 21 in the 1980 proceeding? 22 Ι know him, not Α Τ wasn't aware. 23 personally, but I was not aware that he had testified. 24 All right. Would you -- I apologize it's 25 NEAL R. GROSS

1	not in the pages that I've copied for you, but if you
2	would look at the original transcript that's on your
3	right there, and look at page 1849. I believe that
4	identifies this as being the testimony of Mr. Hewson,
5	and I'll hand out a copy, which if you would just
6	attach to the back of this exhibit so that there's no
7	misunderstanding about whose testimony this is. You
8	can verify that this is the testimony of Edward
9	Hewson?
10	A Yeah, this is the man I know.
11	Q Okay.
12	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: And what was his
13	position, sir?
14	THE WITNESS: He was was at this
15	point, it says Vice President of King Broadcasting
16	Company for Cable Television. That was what was
17	called King Video Cable. He basically ran King Video
18	Cable.
19	BY MS. HAND:
20	Q Mr. Myhren, would you turn to page 1860 of
21	the transcript?
22	A Okay.
23	Q And I'd like you to look down to line 13,
24	it's identified on the margin, and the sentence
25	starting with the word "but." Would you please read

that until I ask you to stop? I'm sorry. Read that out loud until I ask you to stop. "But in towns such as Ellensburg, 3 Washington, or Twin Falls, Idaho, the people in those communities relate and want news and other things from 5 6 the more distant, larger markets." 7 Continue, please. Q "The people, for example, in Ellensburg, 8 Washington, which is about 120 miles east of Seattle, 9 over the mountains, that is a college community, about 10 8,000 students, a lot of professors, plus a farm 11 community, they receive the Yakima channels directly 12 via a translator, UHF, very small market. 13 Yakima is about 120th in the market." I think it must 14 mean the 120th market size or something. 15 "But they relate to Seattle. They shop in 16 They consider the news and programming 17 Seattle. available from Yakima to be, I suppose you would say, 18 19 hayseed. Seattle is the 14th market. They want the 20 Sonics, they want Huskie football, they want to know 21 about Mariners' baseball, and that was the reason they 22 started the cable system initially." 23 That's enough. Thank you. Okay. 24 0 25 A Okay.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	Q Mr. Myhren, do you believe that is still
2	true today, that, for example, subscribers in
3	Ellensburg, Washington, would be interested in what is
4	happening in Seattle, Washington?
5	A I think that's true, yes.
6	Q Do you think that would have been true in
7	the period 1990 through 1992?
8	A Yes, I do.
9	MS. HAND: I just want to also clarify
10	that this portion of the transcript in fact, the
11	entire transcript of Mr. Hewson has been
12	incorporated into the record by designation and it is
13	direct case.
14	I have no further questions. Thank you,
15	Mr. Myhren.
16	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: I have one
17	question
18	THE WITNESS: Sure.
19	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: before we move
20	on. You noted a little while ago that with respect to
21	one of your cable stations, cable networks, the local
22	cable
23	THE WITNESS: Okay. We call that the
24	cable system.
25	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: System.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Yeah, okay.

That, in ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Sorry. it required -- the City Council in that particular jurisdiction required you to continue to carry a signal that it wanted dropped.

> THE WITNESS: Right.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: I assume it wanted to drop it because of programming reasons.

It was duplicative THE WITNESS: Right. of other things that were on.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Question, is this where the City Council, the city utility, or the regulatory authority requires cable systems to play or not play certain signals?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. This has been -- this has been a continuing battle in the cable industry since its beginning, because, of course, cable is municipally franchised. And it either gets franchise or -- the company either gets one from the city, which is the City Council, or it doesn't, and then the City Council gets certain swaying over what happens with that system, and, in fact, I would -- I would maintain often violates first amendment rights of the cable operator in so doing -- another issue. Maybe that is the core issue.

But in any event, the -- the City Council 1 often has had rights, and these have varied as federal 2 legislation has changed over a period of time, to set 3 -- to set pricing for the cable operator. 4 ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Does this have a 5 significant --6 THE WITNESS: And that obviously has --7 has an affect -- if the City Council says, "You know, 8 I'm going to set your pricing, and by the way, I'd 9 like you to carry this channel." The cable operator 10 has a different view than he might if he were making 11 that -- that decision in an open field. 12 ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Does this have an 13 impact -- any kind of substantial impact on your 14 business? 15 I would say that municipal 16 THE WITNESS: regulation has a -- had a substantial negative impact 17 on the business, but I'm -- you know, I'm getting into 18 lobbying here. I --19 ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Does it have any 20 impact on your programming? 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. I think that -- that 22 -- that it has -- it has kept cable from doing, as it 23 has begun news channels locally, from doing some of 24 the hard-hitting -- hard-hitting local investigative 25 NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

reporting it might have done. 1 ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Does it force you 2 to go into sports or into movies or into some other 3 arena that you would not otherwise go into? 4 typically. Not Not 5 THE WITNESS: 6 typically, you know. Ιt may force you to do duplication as it did in this -- this one case. 7 know, this wasn't a regulation in the case of 8 Westerly, which was the situation we were talking 9 about, the Westerly, Rhode Island system. It wasn't 10 pure written regulation. It was spoken suasion on the 11 part of the Council. 12 ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Thank you. 13 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: If you'd turn to 14 page 3 of your testimony, the last full paragraph. 15 THE WITNESS: Page? 16 17 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Page 3. THE WITNESS: Of what? 18 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: I'm sorry. Page 4. 19 THE WITNESS: Of which -- which one? 20 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Your testimony. 21 THE WITNESS: Oh, my testimony. Okay. 22 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: The last paragraph 23 says -- the first sentence, second half says, "The 24 decision to subscribe to cable tends to be made more 25

by men than by women." What is the basis for that 1 statement? 2 WITNESS: Well, there has been 3 research done that has -- has shown that that decision 4 is more -- it's consumer research that has been done 5 that has been shown it's been more a male decision 6 than a female decision. Obviously, it can be made by 7 either. In some cases, it's made by the woman alone. 8 In other cases, it's a joint decision. 9 But -- but primarily, and I think the --10 good grief, the last research I saw on this was maybe 11 1989, right about the beginning of this period, by 12 CTAM, did some research in which I 13 preponderance on this issue was maybe 57 percent male 14 decisionmaking and 39 percent, or some number female, 15 and the remainder don't know type of thing. 16 that kind of a difference. 17 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Thank you. 18 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: I'm still not quite 19 certain how you pronounce your last name. 20 THE WITNESS: Marin (phonetic). 21 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Marin (phonetic). 22 23 Okay. THE WITNESS: Yes. It doesn't pronounce 24 25 like it spells.

1	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: You said that as a
2	broadcast station, you wake up in the morning looking
3	at the Nielsens. You said as a system operator, they
4	mean nothing. Do you literally mean they don't mean
5	anything to the cable operator?
6	THE WITNESS: Well, we have to make this
7	distinction again between a cable operator and a cable
8	programmer. To a cable programmer, they can have some
9	significant importance, as what I said
10	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Well, the cable
11	programmers
12	THE WITNESS: Right.
13	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: is what I'm
14	interested in.
15	THE WITNESS: Yeah. Well, as a cable
16	programmer, which we are with regard to Television
17	Food Network, or we will be with America's Health
18	Network
19	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Maybe I spoke too
20	quickly. I'm talking about cable system
21	THE WITNESS: System operator.
22	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Yes.
23	THE WITNESS: Okay. Yeah, that
24	terminology is really confusing to a lot of people.
25	The way we use it is is we say if you build the
	NEAL R. GROSS

cable down the street, and bring in the programming 1 from whatever sources, do some of your own local 2 programming, and send the bills out to the customers, 3 you're a cable operator. 4 If you start up something called ESPN or 5 USA Network, and do all of the programming and put it 6 7 up in satellite and try to talk the cable operator into buying it, then you're a cable programmer. So 8 9 you're saying --CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Cable operator. 10 Okay. THE WITNESS: 11 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Nielsen means 12 nothing to him, him or her? 13 THE WITNESS: I think it would be wrong to 14 say that for all cable operators it means nothing, but 15 it's -- it's really quite unimportant. 16 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Where does the cable 17 operator get the information of what the people who 18 are in that district are interested in? 19 THE WITNESS: They do surveys with the 20 subscribers, or potential subscribers. They live in 21 the community, and they typically are talking to 22 people constantly about it. They get letters. So 23 there is a lot of local information about, you know, 24 what we'd like to have. They can also see whether 25 NEAL R. GROSS

additions of certain kinds of programming elsewhere have increased subscriber roles.

Rather than looking at Nielsens, you know, when the cable operator gets up in the morning the cable operator says, "How many subscribers do I have? Did I lose any? Did I gain any? And what do I have to do to get more? And what do I have to do to keep the ones I have?" That's really the question they ask.

Now, if all of the programming that they had on their cable system was unwatched by anyone, they would clearly lose subscribers over a period of time and then they'd have to say, "Gee, do I have the right mix of programming?" But whether the Nielsens bulk up to a large number on certain kinds of programming it really isn't -- isn't -- that isn't considered important by the cable operator.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: So it's a question of really not being considered important.

THE WITNESS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Not that there is no value to it, but it just doesn't have any --

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I wouldn't say that there's no value to the Nielsen numbers to a cable operator. I would say this, though. Really, if

you're in the business, you'll find that -- if I talk to most people who operate cable systems at the local level, who are the people who make the final program decisions about Nielsens, their eyes sort of roll up.

I mean, they don't really understand them completely, and they don't talk about them, and they don't think about them. For someone at my level, they become more important, because obviously I've got a broadcast business over here, so I've come to understand that the Nielsens clearly have a -- have a -- have a place in the programming world. But in the cable system world, they just don't mean much.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: I believe you made a statement that you would like to get rid of the movies on the broadcast system as a distant signal, and you would have sports, I gather, as the -- would you want a 24-hour sports station?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Well, of course, we do have that with most -- almost every cable system carries ESPN. But I would rather have something of a perishable type there.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: As a matter of 24-hour programming, is there anything available?

THE WITNESS: Well, there wouldn't be.

You see, you wouldn't have -- that's why I said that's

in the ideal -- in the ideal situation, because there just aren't enough live sports events to cover all of that. Yeah, you're right on that.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Well, I took you to mean that, really, if it was coming in on a distant signal, you wouldn't have any chance for advertising. So, therefore, that's a negative. Whereas, if it was coming in on the locals, or some other network, you would have the chance to advertise.

THE WITNESS: Well, that's generally true type of signals. matter what of distant Noprogramming you're talking about on a distant signal, the fact is that -- that you -- as a cable operator, you look at the distant signal and you say, "Okay. I'm going to pay something for that distant signal," advertising revenue generating have no and capability within that signal, because I can't change I can't take 30 seconds of anything on there. programming out or one of their ads out and put my ad Can't do that. in.

Whereas on all of the other satellite delivered, the ESPNs, the CNNs, the USA Networks, the American Movie Classics, on all of those channels, I, as a local cable operator, am given some spots where I can insert my commercials. So I can make more money

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there.

Now, so I wouldn't really carry a distant signal unless I thought there would -- because I'm paying for the distant signal, I don't get any direct revenue generating capability. The reason why I carry it is because I say there is something on that distant signal which is going to attract customers to my system, and that's my other revenue stream. That's my big revenue stream. You know, advertising is five percent of my business. Customer subscriptions are 95 percent.

MS. HAND: Mr. Chairman, just so the record is clear, I'd like to move to have NAB 1990-'92 Exhibits 2-X and 3-X admitted into evidence.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Any objections to it? They will be admitted.

(Whereupon, the above-referred to documents, previously marked as NAB 1990-1992 Exhibits Nos. 2-X and 3-X for identification, were received into evidence.)

Counsel, do you have any redirect examination for the witness?

MR. GERSCH: Very briefly.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: You may proceed.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

23

24

25

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GERSCH:

Q Do you still have the prepared testimony in front of you, Mr. Myhren?

A Yes.

Q I believe you had been asked a question about page 4 there, and just directing your attention to the second full paragraph beginning, "For our New England cable systems," I think you erred in your direct testimony about whether GN was carried in New England, is that right?

A I did.

Q But here it's correctly set forth that what you were carrying in New England was TBS, OR, and PIX, as well as some SBK, is that right?

A Yeah. We have WGN in so many of our systems across the country, but we do not have them in -- have it in New England, as the -- the written testimony shows.

Q Okay. Take a look at Program Suppliers Exhibit 19-X. That's the one that begins with Beacon system. I'm sorry. I'm looking at the wrong line. Take a look at 16-X, not 19-X, the one that --

- A That's the other list of --
- Q The New England stations, that's the New

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

England systems. 1 Okay. That distinction, by the Okay. 2 way, is systems is cable and stations are broadcasts. 3 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Mr. Stewart advised us of that about four days ago, and --5 (Laughter.) 6 -- we've tried to adhere to it. 7 THE WITNESS: It's hard. It's hard to 8 9 keep track of. BY MR. GERSCH: 10 And if you'll look at the last page of 11 that exhibit, the Westerly --12 Okay. 13 Α -- the Westerly system. Westerly carried Q 14 not just throughout the '90-'92 period, but 15 earlier and later than that, is that correct? 16 17 Α That's correct. And then if you turn back to the first 18 page, I believe Mr. Lane was questioning you about OR 19 carriage on Fall River, and he correctly pointed out 20 that WOR stopped carrying WOR in it looks like the 21 I'm not sure I can get the exact date. 22 Yeah, but we -- we picked up TBS at that 23 Α point, and -- when we dropped OR. 24 So this is --25 0

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	l
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	1

A I mean, it was not exactly coincident, but
that was that was in other words, what we did
was to pick up another superstation that had a lot of
sports on it. In fact, arguably more sports on TBS
than there was on OR.

Q So you replaced OR with TBS, and during the same period you also carried PIX, is that correct?

A Right, and the Yankees.

Q Okay. Put that aside. If you'd take a look at Program Suppliers Exhibit 18-X, which is the Factbook. And take a look at the second page where, again, I believe you were questioned about Fall River. Up in that right-hand -- top right-hand column, they talk about the programming received off air, and I wonder if you take a look at that these list the broadcast stations that presumably would have been available on Fall River, if this is accurate. Do these carry movies?

A Sure. If we go down from -- well, if you go down from WBZ, WLVI, WJAR, WLNE, I mean, you can go through a lot of -- they carry a lot of syndicated programming, and they carry -- and they carry a lot of movies.

Q And how about moving further down to where they talk about the programming via satellite? Those

ᅦ	are
2	A Well
3	Q Do those carry movies as well?
4	A Yeah. Yeah. Of course. They well,
5	let's let me look through here. Well, Family
6	Channel, for example, carries movies and syndicated
7	programming. Lifetime carries carries movies and
8	syndicated programming. TNT it's listed here as
9	Turner Network TV. USA Network. I mean, what they
10	are made up of primarily are syndicated shows and
11	movies.
12	Q And Nickelodeon, that would be that's
13	a lot of syndicated shows?
14	A Nickelodeon has some syndicated; they also
15	have some original stuff.
16	MR. GERSCH: No further questions.
17	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay. Questions?
18	Any questions?
19	Okay. Mr. Myhren, you may have been
20	surprised a little while ago when we didn't have much
21	reaction to your testimony. We were concentrating
22	very diligently on your testimony.
23	THE WITNESS: All right.
24	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: As far as the
25	terminology, we even understood a term that you didn't
- 1	NEAL D. CDOSS

1	use, and that was when you were offering advertising
2	from networks of systems, that those are called
3	avails.
4	(Laughter.)
5	THE WITNESS: Right.
6	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Thank you,
7	Mr. Myhren.
8	THE WITNESS: Which is short for
9	availabilities.
10	(Laughter.)
11	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay. You're
12	excused. Thank you very much.
13	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
14	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
15	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Are you ready to
16	proceed with your next witness?
17	MR. GERSCH: Yes, we are.
1.8	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay.
19	MR. GERSCH: Joint Sports Claimants call
20	Mr. James Mooney.
21	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Mr. Mooney, would
22	you raise your right hand, please?
23	WHEREUPON,
24	JAMES P. MOONEY
25	was called as a witness by Counsel for the Joint
	NEAL R. GROSS

Sports Claimants and, having been first duly sworn, assumed the witness stand, was examined and testified 2 3 as follows: CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Thank you. You may 4 5 be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. GERSCH: Please state your name for the record. 8 Q 9 My name is James Mooney. Α And, Mr. Mooney, from July of 1984 through 10 0 June of 1993, how were you employed? 11 was President and Chief Executive 12 Officer of the National Cable Television Association. 13 During the three years prior to July of Q 14 1984, how were you employed? 15 I was the Chief Operating Officer of the 16 trade association. 17 Could you tell the panel what is the 18 National Cable Television Association? 19 NCTA, as it is more broadly known, is the 20 Α principal trade association of the cable television 21 industry. During my time there, we represented about 22 3,000 of the 9,000 or so cable television systems in 23 the United States, but those 3,000 systems served 24 approximately 90 percent of the cable subscribers in 25 NEAL R. GROSS

the country. So we had pretty much all but the very smallest of systems, and all of the big companies known in industry parlance as MSOs or multiple system operators.

NCTA was not then, and is not now, a full service trade association in that it doesn't attempt to help its members too much in the actual running of their businesses, or try to help them with insurance programs and things of that nature. It's pretty much, I'd say, about 85 percent a public policy outfit, responsible for the legislative and regulatory affairs of the industry, with those other -- with only those other activities as are -- bear some relationship to the public policy aspects of the industry.

Q And you mentioned the makeup of cable systems, operators of cable systems in the NCTA. Are there also cable networks who are --

A Yes.

Q -- members of the NCTA?

A Yes, we represented I think all of the nationally distributed cable networks, as well as some of the regionally distributed networks as well, and also had as associate members some of the manufacturers of equipment.

Q What were your responsibilities when you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

were President and CEO of the NCTA?

A Well, we ran it pretty much like a company. I had a Board of Directors who set policy and who -- and met to do so four times a year. And in addition to the board, there was also an Executive Committee who -- who gave us policy guidance in the intervals between board meetings.

But I had within my job description the authority to carry out all of the executive functions, including, the way the thing was structured, the hiring and firing and compensation of employees, and, in general, the day-to-day, week-to-week, and even month-to-month decisions on who would do what in furtherance of the policies established by the board.

Q Mr. Mooney, you are familiar with the compulsory license and the fee that is charged for the exercise of that license?

A NCTA -- the copyright issue is always with us. It was the first issue I dealt with when I went to NCTA, and it was still very much alive when I left.

Q Well, that was one of the questions I wanted you to elaborate on. What is the basis of your familiarity with the compulsory license and the associated fee?

A Well, the compulsory license, from a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 congressional perspective, was Congress' way out of a problem that came to a head in 1976, where the cable industry, which was still pretty much of a rural, and at best suburban, phenomenon had as one of its most common practices the retransmission of broadcast signals, including distant signals.

And it performed a valuable function in rural areas, particularly those that had no access to television, either because of distance from places where there were TV stations or because of topography that intervened -- interfered with the signal, and I think you heard Tryg Myhren talk about mountainous terrain and how people who are in the business of selling TVs had to figure out how to bring the signal in so they could sell the TVs, and so that led them into the cable business, and that's how the industry started in the late '40s and early '50s.

But as cable began to -- to change from an altogether rural phenomenon into only a semi-rural and suburban phenomenon, it began to encounter resistance from the broadcasting industry, which thought at that time, with substantial FCC support, that broadcasting was the chosen means of delivering television in the United States, and that cable was an illegitimate form of television, and then there were significant efforts

NEAL R. GROSS

made by the broadcasters to suppress the industry through the use of the federal regulatory process. And they were pretty successful at that through the '60's and '70s.

There also arose, as a consequence of cable becoming a more widespread phenomenon, some unhappiness in the -- what we call the Hollywood community, which means mostly the studios. That in their judgment cable was using their product to its profit without compensating them, and they resisted it as well.

Most of the resistance of the Hollywood community and the broadcasters took one of two forms, either seeking to get the regulatory authorities of the FCC to suppress the technology, or to seek judicial relief for what were described as violations of copyright. Twice the Supreme Court held that the then in effect Copyright Act, I think of 1909 -- I'm sure one of the lawyers in the room can correct me if I'm wrong on that -- simply did not contemplate, and, therefore, did not cover cable retransmissions of broadcast signals, that this was something outside the law and not protected by copyright.

Well, the Hollywood guys and the broadcasters banged away at Congress, and to the

sports guys I might add, and Congress long enough to do something about this, to get Congress to sit up and pay attention. And the cable guys banged away at Congress from the other side saying, "You can't put us out of business because this will make all of the people we serve and bring TV to very unhappy."

And the result was the classic legislative compromise, which -- in which Congress, in effect, said, "You can continue to do what you're doing, but henceforth, at least with respect to the distant signals, you must pay royalty fees for the privilege, which will be deposited into a fund and periodically divvied up amongst the various claimants who show up saying, 'We have a stake in this as owners.'"

Q And as time went on, I take it you were personally involved in formulating the NCTA's position with respect to --

A Well, immediately upon enactment of this law, the people who had been against the cable systems carrying out this activity began to try to agitate for the actual appeal. And when I arrived on the scene, which was the end of 1980, beginning of 1981, there was already in full swing a move on the part of the Hollywood broadcasting and sports industries to seek the act's repeal. And I think hearings had already

NEAL R. GROSS

1	been hearings had been held before the House
2	Subcommittee on Intellectual Rights and Trademark as
3	early as 1979.
4	Q I just want to stay with your personal
5	familiarity of this subject before turning you over
6	for
7	A The first thing I did when I
8	Q Let me just
9	A Yeah.
10	Q Let me just stick with your personal
11	familiarity before we tender you for questioning on
12	your qualifications to anyone who wants to ask. You
13	were involved in the interaction with the Congress
14	over whether the compulsory license should be
15	retained, is that right?
16	A Retained, repealed, or modified, yeah.
17	Q All of the above. Also, in terms of
18	negotiating with the various different elements of the
19	cable industry about what their positions ought to be
20	with respect to whether the compulsory license should
21	be maintained or repealed or
22	A Well, consulting with the various
23	interests in the cable industry, yes, certainly.
24	MR. GERSCH: At this point, we would
25	tender Mr. Mooney for voir dire.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Any questions of 1 2 Mr. Mooney? hearing any questions, you 3 proceed, counsel. 4 Thank you. MR. GERSCH: 5 BY MR. GERSCH: 6 Mr. Mooney, could you state what the 7 0 purpose of your testimony is here today? 8 Oh, I think to establish, within the 9 context of my experience, what it is that cable 10 operators value about distant signals. 11 Okay. And could you summarize what that 12 0 13 opinion is? Historically? Α 14 If you could just keep it to a summary, 15 Q but short. 16 I think at one point distant signals were 17 easily one of the most attractive things about cable 18 TV, because they either represented the operator 19 bringing TV to places where there was no TV, or 20 represented bringing more TV to places where there was 21 very little TV. 22 Until the FCC began to loosen up broadcast 23 licenses in the early 1980s, there were very few, if 24 independent television stations to be found 25 NEAL R. GROSS

outside the top 50 markets. There were affiliates of the three networks, and that was it, which is historically one of the reasons there are only three networks.

Q Did there come a time when that changed?

A When the cable operators began to bring distant signals to these places, it was quite popular because it gave people options. But as the cable industry grew, in -- both in terms of its geographic ubiquity, but also in terms of its financial wherewithal, and was able to amass its own program resources, the role of distant signals were altered.

They became, in time, significantly less valuable in the sense that they brought unique added value to the cable service, because one of the things that happened as the cable industry matured was that there were launched lots of cable networks which sort of looked and felt like independent broadcast stations — the USA Network, TNT, the Family Network, the evening part of the Nickelodeon Network, and so forth — which had a pretty good, and indeed in some respects superior, lineup of syndicated programs and movies.

And where there had been a shortage of this kind of programming previously, now there began

NEAL R. GROSS

to be a surfeit of it. And in my -- in my written testimony, I -- I allude -- I illustrate to some degree what kind of change has occurred and the degree to which movies and syndicated programming are now very plentiful on basic cable service, on that tier of service which most people actually subscribe to, which I've heard referred to here as expanded cable.

And certainly during the period that we're discussing, virtually all cable subscribers subscribed to the expanded basic rather than the so-called narrow basic. If a system had more than five percent of its subscribers take the narrow basic, it was cause for comment in the industry. It was that rare.

But the one exception, of course, was -was -- was and is major league sports. Distant
signals are still an extremely important, arguably the
most important source of out-of-market major league
games on cable, and the industry continues to prize
distant signals mostly, not entirely, but mostly for
that reason.

Q Before we get into sports, just so we can perhaps touch on some of the things in your written testimony, I believe you said that you illustrate -- but you were talking about in terms of the plentiful nature of alternative programming. That's on page 5

of your written testimony, is that right? Do you have 1 a copy of that there? 2 3 Α Yes. And that's that first full paragraph? Q 4 Yes. Α 5 Which continues on to page 6? 6 0 7 Yes. Δ And what is the point that you're making 8 Q 9 there? Α Well, the point that I make there is that 10 distant signals at one time, prior to I'd say the --11 the late 1980s, distant signals were an extremely 12 important source of movies, syndicated programming, 13 and sports, in the cable operator's service offering. 14 But that as time went on, distant signals became less 15 important, certainly with respect to movies 16 syndicated programs, because you had so many other 17 sources of syndicated programs. 18 should add not only on the cable 19 networks, which play a very important role here -- in 20 fact, in recent -- since about 1988, even outbidding 21 some of the -- some of the broadcasters for national 22 distribution rights to very popular programs like 23 Murder, She Wrote, but also as a result of 24 proliferation of independent stations beyond the first 25 NEAL R. GROSS

1	50 markets.
2	I think it's important not to
3	underestimate that as an important factor in the
4	relative diminution of the previous special role
5	played by superstations and distant signals in
6	general.
7	Q And as this these additional sources of
8	programming became available to the additional
9	these cable networks, what happened to the
10	superstations, in your opinion, during this period of
11	time?
12	A What happened to them?
13	Q How did the availability of these
14	additional sources of programming affect the
15	superstations?
16	A Well, it has made it more competitive. I
17	think that
18	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Excuse me. What was
19	your question?
20	MR. GERSCH: My question was Mr. Mooney
21	had been describing
22	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Just ask your
23	question. I don't think I understood it.
24	MR. GERSCH: Certainly.
25	BY MR. GERSCH:
	NEAL R. GROSS

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1.	0	
1	1	
1.	2	
1.	3	
1	4	
1.	5	
1	6	
1.	7	
1.	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	

	Q	As	these	additi	lonal	sourc	ces	of c	able
progr	amming	came	e into	being,	the	cable	net	works	you
were	refer	ring	to,	how	did	that	aff	ect	the
super	statio	ns?	And I	I'm ref	errir	ng to	the	types	s of
thing	s you	disc	ıss on	pages	6 and	7 of	your	g	oing
into	7 of y	our t	cestimo	ony.					

A I think that with respect to those superstations which historically had claimed to be unwilling superstations, and as a practical matter that means everybody other than WTBS, they discarded the cloak of unwillingness and became rather avid seekers of carriage on cable systems across the country, as well as openly competing for the affections of the cable industry and trying to market their signal in such a way as to ensure continued carriage.

Q Okay. Let's go to the middle of page 7 of your prepared testimony where you talk about the controversy over the compulsory license.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Excuse me. Maybe before you get into that, we could take our break.

MR. GERSCH: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: We'll resume again in 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were off the

NEAL R. GROSS

record from 2:14 p.m. until 2:27 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: You may proceed when you're ready, Mr. Gersch.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (continued)

BY MR. GERSCH:

Q Okay, directing your attention to page seven of your testimony -- prepared testimony, Mr. Mooney, you discuss here the controversy over compulsory license. Could you please explain why the compulsory license has been controversial?

A It has been the source of a great deal of unhappiness in the broadcasting industry. Broadcasters have felt, whether correctly or not, that cable uses its own -- the broadcast signals to compete against other broadcasters, and they resented that. It has no been the only source of unhappiness within the broadcasting industry directed at cable.

I think one of the things that makes broadcasters, of course, some of them unhappy is there mere existence of cable television. As I've suggested before, some broadcasters see it as an illegitimate media. But in any event, it has been something about which broadcasters could crystallize their resentment of cable.

It moreover has been the glue which on and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

off, over the past -- I'd say from about 1978 through the early 90's, it has been the glue which has held broadcasting and parts of Hollywood together in an on again, off again, anti-cable political alliance. Much of the commentary I have to give you about this involves politics rather than strictly substance.

It involves how these industries war with each other in Washington and in Congress and at the regulatory agencies and how through a good deal of that time interests which have their own reasons to be at odd with each other, and that certainly includes Hollywood and the broadcasting industry, and to some extent, major league sports and the broadcasting industry.

Nonetheless, we'd find ability frequently to unite together and to go hand in hand up to the Hill and complain about the cable industry to Congress, and this created an environment that was difficult for us in ways that went beyond the simple merits of the dispute that was dividing cable from these industries because it created a climate in some corners that was unfavorable to us and would tend to wash over into other issues.

If you believe, as was eventually the anti-cable battle cry, that cable is an unregulated

monopoly, abusive of its customers and some of the political system, including that part of it which results in compulsory licensing, then your resentment, of course, does not stop there; it goes onto other things as well.

And this was a problem for us. Probably more of a problem for us in terms of the political PR that was in terms of the actual probability the license would be repealed.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: With all those millions and millions and millions of subscribers all over the country, isn't that a pretty strong constituency for the cable industry? They all vote -- or a lot of them.

THE WITNESS: I think it was the cable industry's misfortune in the late 80's particularly to get on the wrong side of a lot of the subscribers through its pricing and services policies. But subscribers tend not to organize politically in Washington. Well, there's no -- there are the so-called consumer organizations, but there's no national association of cable subscribers.

There are, however, some extremely skillful and well heeled lobbies representing commercial interests which had reason to, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

contest our modestly skilled but way equally well heeled lobby activities, and it was a big problem for us.

BY MR. GERSCH:

Q You mentioned the joint opposition to the compulsory license. That included the sports leagues as well, is that correct?

A Very much so, yes.

Q Okay. And I believe you mention in your prepared testimony some of the actions taken by the agencies, and particularly the FCC, in response to some of that pressure. What were those types of things?

A The FCC, in 1988, reimposed the so-called syndicated exclusivity rules, or a variant of the syndicated exclusivity rules. Syndicated exclusivity was a federal regulation in place roughly between 1972 and 1980 promulgated by the FCC which gave a local --which, in general terms, gave a local broadcaster the right to require the local cable operator to delete from a distant signal a series or program to which the local broadcaster had bought the local rights.

So again, to over simplify, if the local broadcaster had the rights to <u>I Love Lucy</u>, and <u>I Love Lucy</u> was on a distant signal, the cable operator was

bringing in -- the broadcaster had the right to require the cable operator to blank out I Love Lucy. CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Was that at any time 3 or only concurrent times? THE WITNESS: To tell you the truth, I 5 don't remember what the old rule was. I suspect it 6 7 was at any time, or certainly within the same day part. After 1988, when the rule was promulgated again 8 -- put back into force, or a variant of it put back 9 into force, it was at any time. 10 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: At any time, did you 11 12 say? THE WITNESS: Yes. If you had the rights, 13 you had the rights. 14 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: For some specified 15 duration of time? 16 THE WITNESS: For some -- for whatever his 17 contract with the owner of I Love Lucy gave him the 18 rights for. He had to prove exclusivity, but that of 19 course began to be included in these contracts pretty 20 much. 21 So in a typical CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: 22 situation, the owner of copyrighted work and I Love 23 Lucy would negotiate with WGN, give them the exclusive 24 25 on it?

THE WITNESS: What happened with the super stations was that -- I guess one of the unintended consequences of the reimposed Syndex rules is that it sort of drove out of the closet, as it were, those syndicators who really thought that compulsory license wasn't that bad.

And also, it drove out of the closet the feelings of the people who owned WGN and WOR and so forth that they really did like being a super station. And they bought national rights, which had the effect of preventing -- I mean, the owner of I Love Lucy in that event would have effectively given up the right to sell exclusivity against that signal to any local broadcaster.

So the super stations got national clearance for their entire program schedules. Now, that was not true -- tended not to be true of regionally distributed broadcast signals. There were a lot of Syndex claims made against those signals by local broadcasters who had bought the rights to programs on regional signals.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Could you give us an example of the typical situation that you're talking about now?

THE WITNESS: Sure. Let me construct a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

hypothetical situation and let's say with <u>I Love Lucy</u>, which may be owned by Viacom, I'm not sure. But whoever it's owned by would sell the -- sell rights to WGN to show <u>I Love Lucy</u>. Now, the owner of <u>I Love Lucy</u> is fully aware that WGN is a super station up on a satellite with its signal retransmitted by cable systems all over the country.

And in this instance, subsequent to the reissuance of the Syndex rules, that sale of <u>I Love</u>

<u>Lucy</u> would have come with contractual provisions which guaranteed WGN that no other buyer of <u>I Love Lucy</u>

throughout the country would have in his contract whatever exclusivity the FCC required for the local guy to assert exclusivity against the WGN signal.

So, WGN would have what we call national clearance for that program. However, a channel 20 here in Washington is retransmitted throughout southern Virginia and the Carolinas by cable systems as a regional broadcast signal of regional interest because they had some sports package. I don't remember what it was, but it doesn't matter.

Channel 20 is what we call a regional distant signal. And if channel 20 were to have bought I Love Lucy and the cable system in Roanoke was running channel 20 as a distant signal, it is highly

1	unlikely that whatever rights channel 20 had would
2	have prevented the local "indie," independent
3	broadcast station, in Roanoke who also had bought \underline{I}
4	<u>Love Lucy</u> from a Syndex rights that kind of Syndex
5	did work.
6	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Who would be
7	forbidden to broadcast?
8	THE WITNESS: Who would be forbidden to
9	broadcast?
10	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Yes, channel 20 or
11	the
12	THE WITNESS: Channel 20 because it's the
13	out of market station.
14	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Oh, I see.
15	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: So you're saying the
16	local Roanoke station would have been able to buy
17	channel 20 from
18	THE WITNESS: Assuming that his contract
19	had whatever magic words the FCC had established as
20	necessary to invoke its Syndex rights under the rule,
21	yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Now, would there, in
23	typical situations, vast majority of situations, if we
24	can characterize it that way, who would be the
25	purchasers national would it be the super stations?

THE WITNESS: It would be the super stations or the cable networks.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Or the cable network?

THE WITNESS: Like USA, TNT. In other words, the non-broadcast -- the cable networks distributed for sole use by cable television systems. People who don't operate over the air TV stations anywhere but simply have a feed that they put up on the satellite which is beamed down to cable system affiliates throughout the country and distributed through cable systems.

Syndex is a sort of communications act device employed by the FCC to get around the full operation of the compulsory license. It is a limitation. It is a communications act limitation on the use of the compulsory license with respect to distant signals.

And what happened then is industry practice came on on top of that and said we'll just sell these guys national clearance rights outright.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: So you're saying, as I understand you, and I think what bothers you here is because you're interfering with the contractual relationship -- what you're saying here is that I Love

1	<u>Lucy</u> was sold to WGN knowing full well it's going to
2	go throughout the system.
3	Okay, <u>I Love Lucy</u> was also sold to channel
4	20 with the clear intent that channel 20 was going to
5	show that broadcast that signal in its local
6	market. And then you're saying that because a
7	Virginia station that's importing the distant signal
8	which shows <u>I Love Lucy</u> , that they can prevent 20 from
9	showing the <u>I Love Lucy</u> , is that what you're saying?
10	THE WITNESS: In Roanoke.
11	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Oh, Roanoke, okay.
12	THE WITNESS: Yeah, in Roanoke. And it's
13	actually not 20 who would be showing it.
14	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Okay.
15	THE WITNESS: It would be the cable
16	operator.
17	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: So it would be
18	imported?
19	THE WITNESS: It would be imported, that's
20	right, yeah.
21	ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Gotcha. That's
22	clear.
23	THE WITNESS: And what's
24	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: But who is it in
25	Roanoke that can that's got to be someone else
	NEAL R. GROSS

who's brought it --

1.0

THE WITNESS: Whoever's got a local broadcast station down there who's bought local rights. And again, who's used whatever, you know, form the FCC has established.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: That Roanoke channel then -- station, rather, could not bought WGN directly, but it could bought channel 20 which is picking up WGN, is that what you're saying?

THE WITNESS: Probably, yes. Yes, I think that's legally correct. Although it's <u>I Love Lucy</u> that we're interested in here. It's not the total -- WGN only owns the transmission rights to <u>I Love Lucy</u>. It doesn't own <u>I Love Lucy</u>. <u>I Love Lucy</u>, per se, is owned by, you know, whoever in Hollywood owns it.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: But if WGN had the non-exclusive national clearance, some other local station that has local exclusive rights would not be able to block <u>Lucy</u> on WGN but it could block <u>Lucy</u> on some other channel that was retransmitting WGN, is that what you're saying?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I think that's probably right. It all depends what everybody's contract says. So what this has done is reelevate contract law to pretty much the arbiter of who's got exclusivity for

what. And the reason you've got a FCC rule is you've got to have some thing with the force of law to 2 overcome what would otherwise be the total right of 3 the cable operator to take down that signal which 4 5 arises out of the Copyright Act. And you have to overcome the Copyright 6 7 Act, at least partially, somehow. And that's what Syndex does. And then the industries have come on on 8 9 top of that with their contractual provisions to sort of overcome a little bit of that too. 10 ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Let me proceed a 11 little bit further. Assuming you have I Love Lucy 12 being sold for transmission purposes to WGN. WGN then 13 transmits it throughout its system. However, the 14 people that own I Love Lucy also contract separately 15 with a vast majority of the audience of WGN to show \underline{I} 16 Love Lucy in their local stations, okay? 17 Does that impact on the value of \underline{I} Love 18 Lucy to WGN, and who would --19 20 THE WITNESS: Sure. ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: And who would 21 determine that, the contract? 22 Ιt THE WITNESS: The contract, yes. 23 technically -- well, --24 Would they pass ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: 25

that on to their other stations that in fact are picking up the signal?

THE WITNESS: Would they pass it on what?

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Would WGN pass on the lower cost?

THE WITNESS: Oh, no.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: No?

THE WITNESS: Because see, WGN technically isn't the seller of the signal. The seller of the satellite company that the distributes it. If WGN's contract says that the seller of I Love Lucy -- the original owner of <u>I Love</u> Lucy will not contract with any other broadcaster in way that the United States allows in а broadcaster to assert exclusivity against WGN's I Love then WGN has what are known as national clearance rights.

If WGN's contract doesn't say that, and whoever owns <u>I Love Lucy</u> contracts with the guy who owns the Roanoke station that gives him exclusivity against all comers in Roanoke, then he can assert Syndex against the Roanoke cable operator, taking down <u>I Love Lucy</u> as part of the WGN signal.

This a little like unraveling a pole of spaghetti, I know, but it's what happens when you've

got a policy that nobody wants to repeal but everybody 2 wants to --ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Now are you telling 3 us the super stations are the only ones with the 4 leverage to get that kind of deal? 5 THE WITNESS: Pretty much so, yeah. 6 but yes, that's the overall --7 100% so, stations, of course, are paying a premium price too. 8 the 9 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Now illustration you used at one time, you used broadcast 10 station 20, is that correct? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. The only reason I used 12 20 was because it was the -- it came first to mind as 13 an example of a broadcast station in this market, an 14 "indie," an independent, that does happen to be a 15 regional distant signal going down the Atlantic coast 16 through Virginia and the Carolinas. 17 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: I used to be able to 18 get the Orioles on channel 20, but I can't any longer. 19 I don't know why. 20 21 (Laughter.) THE WITNESS: Well, that might be how they 22 got to the originally distributed signal. They had a 23 package that people thought attractive. 24 BY MR. GERSCH: 25

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Q And just to clarify one other point about Syndex, Mr. Mooney. You say those -- that the FCC reinstituted Syndex or repromulgated it in 1988. Those rules didn't go into effect until 1990, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. If you can turn to page nine then of your testimony. On page nine through page 13, you attribute the survival of the compulsory license which you described as a political albatross for the industry peculiarly to sports. Could you explain the basis of your opinion in that regard?

when I was in NCTA was obviously to try to provide advice to my members as to what public policy strategies would be likely to lend -- likely to minimize the kind of difficulty they would encounter in Washington. And if you are a semi-regulated industry that competes with other semi-regulated industries who are adept at using the regulatory process to try to enhance their standing vis-a-vis competitors, you've always got trouble.

Moreover, if you are an industry like the cable industry, which is -- was until the late 1980's primarily a construction industry rather than a

NEAL R. GROSS

24

service industry, you probably annoyed a lot of people with your merchandising and service policies, quite frankly -- cable industry's pricing and service policies annoyed a lot of people into the early 1990's.

And that caused a lot of political trouble in Washington too. Finally, you had other nascent industries coming on who wanted to get a piece of what cable had. And what cable had done essentially was to invent the subscription television business on a large scale -- but who wanted to use the legislative and regulatory process to ease their own entry into that business now that cable had shown, contrary to the expectations of many smart people in the 1970's that people would pay for television.

And that caused a lot of trouble. So one of the things I was always looking to do was shorten my lines, to use a military metaphor, and to reduce the amount of round I had to defend. And then one of the questions which arose nationally in the policy councils of the industry is do we need to keep the compulsory license given that we now have so much of our -- in the way of our own programming resources and our own networks, and given the fact that it's such a political headache for us.

The sports people have always been very well represented in Washington, and team owners tend to be politically consequential with members of Congress from their areas. It is in the nature of politicians and owners of major league teams somehow to have an affinity with each other, or at least seemingly so.

Broadcasters are -- have an enormous amount of latent political authority in this country because they by and large still control the means by which politicians communicate to their constituencies. And I know that when I was a staff aide to a member of Congress, the first thing he did when he went home for the weekend to his district was to go out and make the circuit of the TV stations and do a stand up interview.

And every one -- every other of his 434 colleagues in the House would do the same thing. And if the TV station was hostile for some reason, that was a problem for him. So it would have been imprudent to under estimate the political authority or at least the latent political authority of broadcasters.

And finally, Hollywood people are themselves a very well organized group in terms of

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

13

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

relationships with the political community, and in the person of Jack Valenti, have one of the most effective advocates for an industry in the United States. And I didn't need Jack after me all the time.

So all of those were motivations to see what we could do about shortening the lines by eliminating the compulsory license or at least modifying it in such a way as to eliminate the political controversy that seemed inevitably to accompany it.

And for a period of a couple of years, we went through a pretty serious analysis which at times included direct negotiations with especially the Hollywood guys as to what could be done here. And in the end, we kept running up against sports and the inability of my constituents to see how they were going to get past that problem with their subscribers because it would create a lot of trouble, it was felt, in the subscriber base if they didn't have it -- if longer have access to the sports, professional major league sports that were characteristic especially of the super stations.

And to a lesser extent, and to a much more sporadic extent, we had some problems with broadcast news in core cities. Although, I had only a small

anyone.

number of my major companies that were concerned about that.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Typically who is in favor of eliminating compulsory licenses?

THE WITNESS: Within my industry or -CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Actually, both --

THE WITNESS: Well, programmers would -the cable networks would have loved to see the
compulsory license go because -- for distant signals.
There is also a compulsory license for local signals
which doesn't figure much into this controversy. The
cable program networks would have been very happy to
see the compulsory license for distant signals go away
because of the distant signals which they were very
properly, as their competitors, would go away from
cable systems too.

Chicago TV station and no longer be selling national advertising in competition with the USA network. And that would make the people at the USA network very happy. I think that a lot of my more politically sophisticated CEO's of cable operating companies would have been happy to see the compulsory license for distant signals go away too because they were worried

about the stability of their assets.

They were worried about the stability of

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Who does the "they" refer to?

THE WITNESS: The chief executive officers of major cable companies. They were worried about what happened to the value of their assets if the government didn't eventually come along and because of some general politic unhappiness with the cable industry do things that would really hurt us, which eventually happened.

And I think that Ted Turner openly, and the proprietors of the other super stations less openly, would have been unhappy too because they would have lost what amounted to national networks. WGN and its owners, you know, were of course quite worried that they were nationally distributed and the advantage of that up to the nth degree when made up their rate card for advertising and when they decided who to go out and market their ad slots to.

And the people who bought that time understood that they were paying national money for national exposure.

BY MR. GERSCH:

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	Q Mr. Mooney, if I could just clarify. The
2	first set of groups you were mentioning, the cable
3	networks that were part of the NCTA, and I think what
4	you referred to as some of the more sophisticated
5	CEO's of the cable companies, those were folks within
6	the NCTA umbrella that you were citing as examples of
7	people who would have been happy to have the
8	compulsory license disappear, is that correct?
9	A Yes.
10	Q And then Turner and WG, they were examples
11	of people who you would say wanted it to stay, is that
12	correct?
13	A Yes, although Turner was a member of my
14	organization, but WGN was not.
15	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: You said in favor of
16	elimination. You said cable companies.
17	MR. GERSCH: I took you to mean cable
18	operators of cable systems, the MSO's is that who
19	you're referring to?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm sorry, that's
21	in the lexicon of our business, cable companies, the
22	people who are called cable operators are cable
23	operators and the programmers are programmers. And
24	to the outside world, I know that it's all one big
25	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Was there anyone
	NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other than the super stations that were interested in keeping compulsory licenses?

Sure, the smaller cable THE WITNESS: operators were, especially those companies that were Companies that run by old timers in the business. still had a strong entrepreneurial culture in the sense that they were still run by the guy who founded them back in 1947 and who made his business pretty much through the importation of distant signals and who had -- and who, at a time when there was very little money in the cable industry, helped to finance lawsuits ultimately resolved in the Supreme Court asserting the cable operators' right to retransmit broadcast signals, and many who have come to believe that there was a kind of divine right to retransmit broadcast signals and to attempt in any way to interfere with -- was sacrilegious, at least.

BY MR. GERSCH:

Q And you've been describing sort of the line of who was for and who was against within the cable industry community. There have been, I believe -- Judge Jiganti may have broadened this question at the end and said anywhere, who was opposed and who was in favor.

Going beyond the cable industry now -- for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

example, sports, movies -- what was their position on the compulsory license?

A The movie guys were pretty much against it and wanted to see it repealed unless they were in their -- unless they could see some business advantage in not having it repealed. And some of them used to go back and forth on this. There were some mixed feelings within the Hollywood community about this and within companies within the Hollywood community especially as the copyright pool grew larger and began to take on the character of serious money.

Similarly, there were divisions within the broadcasting industry about the license in part because broadcast station owners whose signals were being distributed beyond their market of license by cable operators frequently were able to profit from that in terms of their ad sales, but also because there was a significant amount of cross ownership between broadcasting and cable companies.

And sometimes you'd see one company with forces on both sides of the issue.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Now why would the movie industry be in favor of elimination?

THE WITNESS: The traditional position of the movie industry, which is, for these purposes, also

the syndication industry -- they tend to be pretty much the same companies -- is that if you don't pay us for it directly, you're stealing it. And their traditional first encounter especially with new media that employ their product in some way that does not involve a direct transaction with them is to strongly oppose the new media and try to kill it, as they at one point tried to do with cable industry and as at one point they tried to do with the VCR industry in the Betamax case when Hollywood essentially sought to have the courts declare it to be a violation of the Copyright Act for video retailers to rent tapes out to individuals and not give a portion of each sale back to the original creator of the tape.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: You know, I saw that in legislative history somewhere where really one of the underlying reasons for the compulsory licensing was the practicality aspects of this thing. How in the world do you change? Now, let me ask you, please. If there were no compulsory licensing, what would be your alternative? How would you achieve a fair distribution of the market value of these products in the market?

THE WITNESS: Well, back then it couldn't, in the 60's and 70's.

NEAL R. GROSS

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: I'm talking about now more recently, especially with the computer systems advancing to the point where they are, why couldn't you do that today?

THE WITNESS: What you need -- I mean, you've got in a typical -- I almost say broadcast day, because that's what we say in the television business. In a typical TV day on a channel that's programmed all day, you have got hundreds and maybe even thousands of different sets of rights involved.

And within programs, you have rights belonging to different people. Sometimes one guy doesn't own all the rights to, let's say -- to pick on I Love Lucy again. I mean, as --

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: If they have to work that out for network broadcasting, why is this so much

THE WITNESS: I'm getting to that. I'm getting to that. What you need to work this out is somebody with -- is somebody to have sufficient money, organizational sophistication, and guaranteed distribution to be able to work it out and line up a whole day. And that's what we call networks. That's what NBS is, that's what CBS is, and that's what ABC is. And today, that's what USA Cable Network is and

TNT and the Family Channel and all of those things.

But it took awhile for the cable industry to get to a point where it had the financial and other wherewithal to be able to have networks that were strictly devoted to it.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: -- some of the super stations. At least they're also like networks.

THE WITNESS: Sure they are. Of course they are. That is what they are. They are networks. They are staffed like networks, they think like networks.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: So why would you assume that TBS and WGN, for example, would go back to being local broadcast -- simply negotiate and Turner would be left hand negotiate with his right hand and go for the Braves, you know -- create the same thing like a price structure.

THE WITNESS: They might do that. I've heard talk from time to time that one or another of them is contemplating doing just that. They are, to some degree, also constrained in what they can do by, you know -- under the Copyright Act. I mean, they may find it in their advantage to allow cable operators to start inserting ads in their signals.

And on the other hand, exact a payment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

direct from the cable operator to them. But they can't do that under the current system.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Let's assume that they're all very knowledgeable of the Copyright Act and they fully intend to honor it, and they fully intend to comply with it. In that circumstance --

THE WITNESS: I do assume that.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: You have to assume that. Assume now then that -- how would the networks, the very large networks, how can they value the various properties which they include in their network?

THE WITNESS: Probably the same -- much the same way. These people are all in the network business. They all derive much of their revenue -- in the case of broadcasters, all of it from advertising. And they're organized as a business to do it that way. Now, the cable networks are organized somewhat differently. Cable networks derive a substantial portion of their revenues, I think still, in most instances -- the majority of their revenues not from advertising, but from fees paid to them directly by the cable operators, affiliation fees.

Which is the -- and from that fact, flow most of the significant business differences between

the cable and broadcasting businesses. And that is why you can have cable networks that are devoted to niche interests. That's why you can have a food network like Tryg Myhren was talking about this morning.

That's why you could have a golf network which has been launched. That's why you could have supposedly coming on line the first quarter of 1996 a hobby/crafts network, because it's not dependent on solely or even mostly on mass market advertising to drive its economics.

ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Like Court TV?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, like <u>Court TV</u>. Exactly like <u>Court TV</u>. If <u>Court TV</u> had to survive on advertising, it would be dead tomorrow morning because there just isn't enough there to carry it. And that too is why, you know, we don't pay much attention to -- in the cable business -- especially on the operator side, we don't pay much attention to Nielsons.

I mean, I don't think I know a cable operator who subscribes to the Nielsons. I know, because I tried to get some once. It is subscription television, and the economics of that are radically different from a media that's driven 100% by advertising.

NEAL R. GROSS

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Well now, didn't have compulsory licenses, the cable operators 2 would have to negotiate with someone to get rates to 3 put -- to have the diversity of programming they want. 4 THE WITNESS: Which they do. 5 How would that 6 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: differ from the negotiations they now have with the 7 cable networks? 8 THE WITNESS: Well, it wouldn't. 9 what they would do. That is the being they would 10 negotiate with, cable networks. 11 And the owners of ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: 12 these various rates would negotiate with the cable 13 networks for program packages? 14 Exactly. That's what THE WITNESS: 15 networks do. They are packagers of rights. 16 17 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: And they do that 18 now. THE WITNESS: Yes, they do. They do that 19 They didn't do that when the compulsory license 20 was an entity because they weren't around or were 21 around only in the form of a show. They didn't have 22 any money. The compulsory license, with respect to 23 distant signals, is something of an anachronism. 24 I don't get paid to defend it anymore. 25 can say that. NEAL R. GROSS

But I think you've also got -- you have to understand that these discussions seem a little abstruse to some guy who's sitting out in Des Moine, who when he comes home after working in the plant, just wants to watch the Cubs game. And he doesn't -- he not only does not understand how the desire to straighten a regulatory line, so to speak, might justly -- might be described as justly stopping the Cubs games from being brought in there against the Cubs' will or whatever, but he isn't interested in listening.

He doesn't want to. All he wants to see is that game. And if there is any interruption in his ability to see that game, he's going to complain to his congressman. And that happens a lot. And the nature of elected officials is such that -- take the path of least resistance, and if you can work it out -- especially if you can work it out with the affected industries, all of whom have other interests pending before the Congress at any given time, you work it out without having to go tell the guy in Des Moines that you're sorry, but he can't have the Cubs game anymore.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Well, how likely is it that someone would have to tell him that? There would have to be plenty of cable systems in Des Moines

just ready to jump in and negotiate either with the Cubs or major league baseball or call up Mr. Garrett and say who do I talk to.

THE WITNESS: Well, perhaps so. Major league baseball would have to speak for the -- I'm not an intimate in the internal --

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Everybody's ready to make a deal if there's money in it for them.

THE WITNESS: From what little I understand of the sports business, that would be easier -- that might be easier said than done because sports, after all -- major league sports is organized around a franchising system where teams have ascertainable, you know, geographic areas. And that's, I guess, for good and sufficient reason.

But again, I'm not expert on that and I shouldn't attempt to comment on it.

a responsibility which is extremely -- for us, extremely serious. No reason for our justification and we're thinking in terms of how do we find the value of these products. We hear on the one side the measuring systems of Nielson and the measuring system of Bortz, and you talked to us about the constant sum technique, if you will, or the measuring technique.

Ι

have

Well, how do we focus on really -- what is the best way of measuring value in this -- in your 2 business or this industry? 3 I think you have to ask THE WITNESS: 4 If it's value to the cable operator, 5 value to whom. 6 ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: Forgive me. 7 should have said for service. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Okay. You ARBITRATOR FARMAKIDES: 10 responsibility to provide service to the community at 11 large for service. 12 THE WITNESS: I think that -- again, the 13 cable operators really don't care that much about 14 Nielsons. I mean, they have to care in the sense that 15 you don't have a business unless your customers are 16 gaining satisfaction from their monthly investment in 17 cable, which must mean that they're watching it and 18 that there is something in it that they find to like. 19 But theoretically, the cable business 20 could work if nobody watched anything, so long as 21 people paid that monthly subscription bill. 22 long as they kept paying the bill, that would be okay 23 because in the cable business, revenue doesn't depend 24 on viewership. In the broadcasting business, revenue 25 NEAL R. GROSS

depends 100% on viewership, and they count it into decimal points when deciding the ad rate that the station is able to get in its marketplace and when counting up what ABC, NBC and etc. are able to get for national ads.

And what you do in the cable business instead is you try to maximize penetration. Now, until -- I'd say about 1985, average penetration of cable systems in the United States was about 55 or 56%. That means 55 or 56% of the homes that could subscribe to cable did, but that 45 or 46% of homes that could subscribe did not.

What are you going to do to get the other 45 or 46%, understanding that with 55, 56, you've probably made your -- okay, you've probably gone to black ink somewhere around 50% penetration as an industry average. You've got a system like Fairfax County, you never hit the black ink.

The industry average is about 50%. Penetration above that level tends to be marginal -goes pretty much to the bottom line because the incremental cost of serving additional subscribers are not that great. So you have a terrific incentive to try to up that penetration rate as much as you can.

And the thinking in the industry since the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

mid 1980's when marketing really began to take hold as a serious enterprise was you go after it in chunks -- after it in pieces. You try to appeal to the discreet tastes among the population that are capable of being addressed through the television network, and then you go after the people who like to watch golf, and who want to watch cooking shows, or who want to watch sporting events.

You've got to protect the sporting population because they, according to the common wisdom in the industry, supported by marketing surveys of companies and industry organizations, the sports fan has always been the single largest group of cable subscribers. We used to call them truck chasers, because when a franchise was let in an area, the joke was that when the cable truck came down the street, people would chase it wanting to subscribe even before the wire was laid.

50%, of when you're at But penetration, you've got all the truck chasers. So after that, it gets harder. And that's why you start to see more niche channels. Always understanding you have to protect your base. That may be more of an you wanted, but it's important than answer understand how much this business is different from

broadcasting.

BY MR. GERSCH:

Q Let me just turn your attention to a couple more things in your prepared testimony, and then we'll conclude. If you look at page ten, bottom of that first full paragraph, you say had Turner --well, just to paraphrase, you say that had Turner not had the Braves and Hawks, it's unlikely that WTBS ever would have gone beyond being a regional signal on cable systems.

Why do you say that?

A Well, I think it represented a judgement on his part, as well as to a significant degree judgement by the cable industry because -- get carriage -- that sports, major league sports, was an important and indeed indispensable part of his line up if he was going to succeed as a nationally distributed super station.

I mean, otherwise why devote -- why should he go to the trouble of trying to achieve that end, and otherwise, why should cable operators give him channel space, which was even more scarce then than it is now? What was the added value? His thing was -- unless it had some big, you know, impressive thing.

And the quickest way to get that is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

sports, major league baseball and basketball.

Q Turning again to another part of your testimony, you mention the fellow in Iowa who might want to watch baseball, the Cubs. You reference in your prepared testimony again in certain -- what you describe -- I think it's either legendary or celebrated instances in which people did attempt to drop WGN, including efforts in Fairfax County.

What happened there?

A They put them back on. The cable operator decided that discretion was the better part invalid and he put it back on so as to extinguish what was rapidly becoming a real problem for him with the public, with the very vocal part of the public out there, and with the local government.

Q And the protest was about losing the Cubs games, is that right?

A About losing the Cubs games, yeah. That's an example I give. I mean, I've had other experiences where members of Congress would come to me and say, you know, why are the -- so and so in my district, one of my people are writing letters to me demanding that I do something.

- Q These are sports examples?
- A Yeah, they're all major league sports.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	Mostly baseball. No member of Congress ever came to
2	me and said they're mad because they lost <u>I Love Lucy</u> .
3	Q Going back to the
4	A The total is major league sports, most
5	frequently baseball.
6	Q Going back to the example of WGN and the
7	effort by Media General in Fairfax to drop it. In
8	your opinion, had the Cubs fans not protested, what
9	was Media General going to do? What did they say they
10	were going to do?
11	A Drop it. They were anxious to get rid of
12	the channel. I think. That was not a channel
13	capacity issue as it was an expense issue. That might
14	have been a 3.75 signal. I'm not sure of that, but it
15	might have been.
16	MR. GERSCH: We have no further questions
17	at this time.
18	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: At this time, it
19	would be a convenient time to take a recess.
20	(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
21	record from 3:20 p.m. until 3:35 p.m.)
22	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Who will proceed
23	first with the questioning?
24	CROSS EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. LANE:

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	Q For the record, I'm Dennis Lane appearing
2	on behalf of Program Suppliers. Mr. Mooney, on page
3	three of your testimony, the first line on that page,
4	you refer to the political consequences of supporting
5	the compulsory license, do you see that?
6	A Page three?
7	Q Yes, the first line at the top of the
8	page.
9	A No. I have cable television began to take
10	its modern form in the late 1970's.
11	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: It's the sentence
12	that carries over from the previous page.
13	MR. LANE: I think you have a different
14	version from mine.
15	THE WITNESS: This must be off a different
16	word processor. The previous sentence. Yeah, okay.
17	MR. GERSCH: You didn't give him the right
18	copy.
19	THE WITNESS: I have the disadvantage of
20	reading
21	MR. LANE: We received the unedited
22	version.
23	MR. GERSCH: It's just the format.
24	BY MR. LANE:
25	Q Okay, now do you see that on the first
	NEAL R. GROSS

line of page three?

A Yes.

Q What did you mean -- how would you define the political consequences?

A Well, as I said, it I think initially energized the -- see, this comment is made within the context of the fact that in 1992 Congress enacted over President Bush's veto a bill of which subjected cable television to not only to reregulation in an economic sense, it referred by the press as reregulation, and we referred to it that way ourselves.

But also, in many respects, a much broader form of regulation than that which had been in effect before, including new forms of regulation. And I see that as the product of a number of things, one of which was the fact that a political coalition was made against us consisting of, in addition to others, the broadcast -- and a substantial part of the Hollywood community.

And for a good part of the period between 1984 when Congress established its original policy respecting cable television and 1992 when it enacted what we regarded as an onerous statute, through a good part of that period, the broadcasting industries and the Hollywood people were attacking us based on their

So it created a lot of problems for us, 2 which I think we would have been well to do without. 3 It provided us -- it stimulated a broader problem for 4 And I wish it --5 us. So is it your testimony that if there had 6 been no compulsory license, the 1992 act would have 7 never come into place? 8 It's conceivable. It is not my testimony 9 Α that had there been no compulsory license it would not 10 You can't make absolute have come into play. 11 statements of that kind with respect to subjects such 12 as these, but I think it's conceivable it wouldn't 13 have -- would have happened. We might have dodged the 14 bullet. 15 We might not have had the broadcasters out 16 against us as vigorously as they eventually were and 17 might have gained the additional vote in the Senate 18 required to sustain the would have been 19 President's veto. Every little bit counts. 20 I want to go back to the Syndex situation 21 just to see if we could try to discuss that a little 22 bit. 23 Sure. 24 Α For Syndex protection to work, you need a 25 Q

resentment of the compulsory licensing system.

minimum of three players, right? You need the distant signal, you need a local station, and you need a local cable system.

A You'll have to describe to me what is meant by "for Syndex to work." For it to work in what respect?

Q Okay, for someone to ask for protection and get it, there has to be those three players, do there not?

A No.

Q No?

A There only has to be the -- there only has to be the -- well, there have to be a different set of players. There have to be -- the guy who owns and is selling the program; the local broadcaster and the cable operator.

Q Okay. All right, but the guy who's selling it has sold it to someone -- has sold the program to someone and it has -- that signal carrying that programming has to be then broadcast or retransmitted into a market where there's a local station that owns the rights to the same program, is that not right?

A Or for the occasion to assert Syndex to arise, there must be some event which effectively

1	challenges and attempts to defeat the local
2	broadcaster's exclusivity rights.
3	Q Right.
4	A Yes.
5	Q And that's done by a distant signal coming
6	in with the program that the local broadcaster has the
7	exclusive rights in?
8	A That is one of the ways it could arise.
9	Q Right. And when you were talking about
10	WDCA, channel 20, coming into Virginia let's just
11	say a lower Virginia market where the same program is
12	on let's just take that as a hypothetical. If the
13	local station wanted to assert its Syndex rights, it
14	would assert them against the local cable system in
15	that Virginia town, correct?
16	A Assuming that it has contractual rights to
17	assert.
18	Q Let's make all those assumptions just to
19	make this simple.
20	A I don't mean to quibble with you, but as
21	a practical matter, in the real world, sometimes
22	lots of times, they've sold the Syndex rights, and
23	lots of times they've withheld them.
24	Q I understand that. We're just we're
25	trying to have a simple example here.
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	A All right.
2	Q So in that situation, only the local cable
3	system in that Virginia town or whatever, market,
4	would be blacked out from that program?
5	A Would have to delete that program, yes.
6	Q Right.
7	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: From "that program,"
8	you're meaning the program
9	MR. LANE: From WDCA, channel 20, that's
10	being imported. That's the same program that the
11	local station carries, isn't that right?
12	THE WITNESS: In this example.
13	BY MR. LANE:
14	Q In this example. And let's say right next
15	to that there was another market that had another
16	a different local station in a different cable system,
17	okay. And that local broadcaster did not assert the
18	right against the cable system. In that market, the
19	cable system could carry the program from channel 20,
20	correct?
21	A Assuming that yes. Assuming he could
22	acquire it otherwise with the compulsory license.
23	Q Right. So that you're not when you're
24	blacking out, you're not the local station isn't
25	calling up WDCA, channel 20, and saying okay, you have

1	to black out that program. It's calling up the local
2	cable system and saying you have to black out that
3	program, isn't that roughly how the rules work?
4	` A Yeah, the rule was created for the benefit
5	of the local broadcaster.
6	Q Right. But it works on a market by market
7	basis where the cable system is located, not where
8	the signal originated?
9	A That's right.
10	Q I want to turn to page five and six of
11	your testimony if we could. On those two pages, you
12	talk about the amounts of programming in 1995 that
13	were available in the Washington, D.C. cable system.
14	Do you see that?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Did you do you know whether this 1995
17	programming availability matched that that was
18	available in 1990 to '92?
19	A My belief is that there would be no
20	significant difference.
21	Q And what is that based on?
22	A That's based on my understanding and
23	experience with the industry my understanding of
24	what the program line up on DC Cablevision was during
25	the years 1990 through 1992.

1	Q When you refer at the bottom of page five
2	I'm sorry.
3	A I should tell you that the reason I picked
4	July 16, 1995 is that happened to be the week I wrote
5	my testimony
6	. Q I had a feeling of that.
7	A for which I had the <u>Post</u> TV Guide.
8	Q What time period were you looking at when
9	you did this? What time period during the day?
10	A Pretty much prime time.
11	Q Prime time?
12	A Yeah. A little bit of fringe. Mostly
13	but not only in the event of a program the bulk of
14	which carried over into prime time.
15	Q Okay, could you just explain what you mean
16	by the term fringe in terms of hours, and also by what
17	you mean by the term prime time?
18	A In the television business, and these are
19	for the most part broadcasting terms, the day is
20	divided into different day parts, and that's how they
21	sell advertising. Sell it in the morning, sell it in
22	the afternoon, which morning goes up to noon, I think
23	afternoon.
24	There's early morning, morning. Then
25	afternoon goes to about 4:00, I think. You begin to
	NEAL D. GDOSS

get into what's called fringe, which according to who you're talking to, will go to either 7:00 p.m. or 8:00 p.m. Some people also designate a period between 7:00 to 8:00 p.m. differently because under FCC rules the broadcast -- the nationally distributed broadcast nets aren't permitted to program during that time.

It's the -- call it the prime time access rules. Technically, prime time, but one to which the national networks have no access. And then you get into prime time, per se, which is the period between 8:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m.; and which is understood in the television business, both broadcast and cable, to be the most desirable part of the day for displaying advertising because that's when you get the audiences who do most of the buying of goods and services.

Q Now as I understand your numbers here on these two pages, at the top of page six, you talk about 5.5 hours per evening on the local independent broadcast stations. Do you see that?

Q Is that 5.5 hours in total or 5.5 hours each?

A 5.5 hours total per evening. If you took the syndicated programs that were displayed on the local independents during that week, you get an

average of 14.6 hours on the cable networks and then 1 5.5 hours on the local independent broadcast stations. Just add up the syndicated programs each evening to 3 get a seven day total, and divide them by seven. 4 And you get 5.5 hours of -- you know, I 5 Love Lucy, whatever they bought in syndication. 6 Now, did you include super stations as a 7 0 network in this analysis? 8 I would have included them -- no, I did 9 10 not include them. I don't believe I did include super I included only the cable networks. stations. 11 Do you believe that the D.C. market is 12 comparable to most markets in the country in the 13 amount of programming available? 14 Α Yes. 15 How many markets have three independents? 16 Q 17 Α These days? A lot. No, in 1990 to '92. Q 18 In 1990 to -- a lot. 19 Α A lot. 20 Q Most of the new stations -- there's very Α 21 little new station construction that's gone on in the 22 last few years. Most of the new station construction 23 occurred during the 1980's. So by 1990, they would 24 25 have been --

Q Why did you pick these eight networks that you include in here?

A Because they seemed to me to be cable networks which are most directly comparable to independent TV stations in terms of the program scheduling they maintain. I was trying as much as I could to do apples to apples. They are programmed in large part pretty much like an independent broadcast station.

Q And you concluded from this analysis that the unique role once played by super stations in these program categories is now a matter of history?

A It's not quite right. It has been my understanding and my feeling and my belief as a result of the time I have spent in the industry that the role played by super stations in cable programming is for the most part contributed to uniqueness, except in sports -- a matter of history.

And I did this analysis to illustrate that belief. But I did not derive that analysis -- that belief from this analysis. I mean, everybody in the cable industry kind of knows this. And I think it would be wrong for me to intimate or testify that I discovered something.

Q Could you turn to pages ten and 11 of your

NEAL R. GROSS

1	testimony? And this is where you compare the amount
2	of sports programming on DC Cablevision for the same
3	week, I take it?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Now during that period, do you know
6	whether the referring to the top line of page 11,
7	did the Orioles play more than five games?
8	A I don't know. I don't know if baseball
9	teams do typically play more than five games a week.
10	Q Okay. Did you count Home Team Sports in
11	this analysis?
12	A Yes, I do. This is one of the markets
13	where Home Team Sports is available as a basic
14	service.
15	Q Now as I calculate this, if you assume
16	three hours for a game, that's about roughly 45 hours
17	of baseball was available in that week. You had 15
18	games over the seven day period. Do you see that?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And do you know, is three hours roughly
21	about the length of a baseball game?
22	A I really don't two and a half, three.
23	It's never occurred to me frankly to calculate it.
24	Q It's 45 hours. That's six and a half
25	hours per day of baseball, isn't it, over the seven
	NEAL R. GROSS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

day period?

A That's the way the arithmetic works out.

I don't know though that all of the 45 hours occurred sequentially. Probably a lot of it was running concurrently.

Q Just as the syndicated series and the movies during the same week were running concurrently, right?

A Yes.

Q Did you limit yourself to the same hours that you looked at the syndicated series and movies for this analysis?

A I don't recall. I might not have.

Q Okay. Now during this period without the super stations, there were eight games on in seven days according to your testimony, is that correct?

A That's what it works out to, yes.

Q And what do you mean in the third line on page 11 that super stations quite clearly fulfill a radically more important role on the D.C. cable system than the one they now claim other program categories?

A Well, I meant that seven out of -- I was stating that in my judgement, seven out of 15 games being on the super stations represented a much more important role for the super stations who are making

baseball available to the population of the District of Columbia than was the case with respect to syndicated programming and movies.

I think that if the syndicated programming and movies available on super stations would have disappeared that week, the impact on the subscribers would not have been that great. But the impact on the baseball fans would have been significant.

Q So instead of watching more than one game a day, which would be what you can see without the super stations eight games in seven days, you could watch two games a day?

A Well, again, I don't know that -- whether these games occurred back to back. I do know that sports fans tend to regard their interest in sports somewhat differently than do people who watch movies and syndicated programs as their favorite genre of television entertainment.

There are -- people don't go around with Murphy Brown on a hat, but they go around with Cubs and Yankees. And people tend to identify personally with their favorite sports teams in a way that they do not identify personally with a TV program. They may like the TV program and they may describe it as one of their favorite programs and try to be home when it

-- normally consider their regard for that program as 2 part of their persona. 3 But in sports, it's different. And in my 4 opinion, seven out of 15 -- you know, when you take 5 eight games and increase them by seven to 15, you are 6 almost doubling the availability of games in that 7 sport to that population during that week, and that's 8 a lot. And proportionately, it is a whole lot more, 9 just in terms of bulk, than would be the case if you 10 to either did analysis with respect the same 11 syndicated programs or movies. 12 But you didn't do the same analysis for s 13 syndicated programs and movies, did you? 14 Α No. 15 You didn't give us any information about 16 super station carriage during that week, did you? 17 I don't believe I did. 18 Α Well, I don't want you to believe. I want 19 you to look at your testimony and tell us whether you 20 did or you didn't. 21 Well, Counselor, without the book in front 22 of me, I can't tell you exactly if I did or not, but 23 I can supply it. 24 this question 25 Well, asked Ι you NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

comes on so they can see it, but they don't consider

긔	previously, Mr. Mooney, so you told me then that
2	you hadn't included the super stations, that's why I'm
3	being a little bit testy about this, because I asked
4	the question before. You told me no, and now you're
5	telling me maybe.
6	A Look, I haven't been a in this fight,
7	so I will refrain from being testy in return. My
8	recollection is, and I should have said if I did not,
9	is that I don't think I did. But I don't remember
10	exactly.
11	Q Okay. But if you
12	A I did this in July.
13	Q That's fine. If you did, you didn't break
14	out the super stations for a separate sentence in your
15	testimony as you did for the sports programs, is that
16	fair to say?
17	A I did not break out the super stations
18	versus syndicated programs and movies as I did with
19	sports.
20	Q So it might have been that I'm sorry.
21	A baseball.
22	Q So it might have been that the super
23	stations would have doubled the amount of syndicated
24	programs available during that week just as it did for
25	baseball, right?
	NEAL R. GROSS

A Not unless they found a way to make the prime time schedule hold more than three and a half or four hours because there aren't that many of them. Mathematically, that would not be a possibility. And you'd have to start out by subtracting what you suggested over three hours per baseball game from the super station schedule, because they couldn't run a game and a syndicated program simultaneously.

Q How would you weigh the relative value of sports and other programming during the evening if I'm viewing and say I'm watching a game and they are changing pitchers so I watch a movie for a while. Then the inning ends, so I watch a series. How would you make that kind of a judgement?

A I care most as a cable operator, I care most about your continuing to write that monthly check out to me. I'm not much interested, quite frankly, in how you divide your viewing hours between the different types of programming.

Q Turning to -- I want to go back to page six of your testimony, if you will. You discuss in the first full paragraph there the term carriage incentive. It is almost right in the middle of the page. Do you see that?

A Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

What do you mean by carriage incentives? 0 3 signal of that network. 9 license fee to the operator? economic effect. Q The carrier. Α understand the Copyright Act. Certainly the --25

By carriage incentives, I mean things offered by the programming network to the cable operator to incent the cable operator to carry the It is whatever competitive devices are used by cable network to say, you know, in addition to the merits of whatever it is programming consists of, carry me not him. You know, you've only got one channel, for example. Now is this an incentive that would lower the per subscriber cost of the license fee, the stated Some incentives have that effect, yes, could have that effect. Most incentives I think are most effective when they result ultimately in some It could be a discount on the licensing fee. It could be a greater number than customary of local avails. In a few recent instances, it even seems to be direct cash payments. You refer at the top of page seven to the fact that I quess it's distant signals aren't -- I'm Is this the common carrier or the distant signal that can not offer add avails? Neither. Neither, as

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	don't know that the carrier would be in a position to
2	offer add avails.
3	MR. LANE: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd
4	like to introduce as Exhibit 21-X a copy of an ad for
5	CableVision Magazine, May 4, 1992. The cover page has
6	Mr. Myhren's picture on it.
7	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: What number is this?
8	MR. LANE: It's 21, sir.
9	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Thank you.
10	(Whereupon, the document was
11	marked for identification as PS
12	Exhibit 21-X.)
13	BY MR. LANE:
14	Q Did you read <u>CableVision Magazine</u> , or do
15	you still read it, Mr. Mooney?
16	A Yes. Yes.
17	Q Is it a describe what it is for us,
18	please.
19	A <u>CableVision Magazine</u> is a trade
20	publication widely read in the cable television
21	industry.
22	Q Now turning to the ad, do you recall
23	seeing ads like this in 1992?
24	A I don't recall this specific ad, nor do I
25	I mean there's a lot of advertising in these
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	magazines. There frequently is advertising from the
2	carriers of distant signals, the satellite carriers.
3	Q Right. Would this seem to be such an ad,
4	sir?
5	A I think it probably is. It is frequently
6	hard to tell. But yes. I think this is probably an
7	Eastern Microwave ad.
8	Q And you see in the middle of the text that
9	it refers in the race for revenues, WWOR's local ad
10	avails make you the winner.
11	A Yes. I see it. I have no idea what that
12	means.
13	Q Do you know whether WWOR and/or Eastern
14	Microwave was making ad avails available to cable
15	operators?
16	A I do not. I believe that Eastern
17	Microwave, at least, would have been prohibited by
18	statute from doing so, with or without the consent of
19	WWOR. Eastern Microwave, in order to fulfill its
20	function is required by statute to be a passive
21	carrier. In the context of this particular law,
22	passive means they can't do anything to the signal
23	except re-transmit it.
24	MR. LANE: I'd like to offer into evidence
25	Program Supplier's Exhibit 22-X, another ad from
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	CableVision Magazine. This is from March 25, 1991.
2	MR. GERSCH: Are you offering it into
3	evidence or you just want to
4	MR. LANE: I said I'd like to.
5	(Whereupon, the document was
6	marked for identification as PS
7	Exhibit 22-X.)
8	MR. GERSCH: Mr. Lane, I'd just like to be
9	clear. As I understand it, 21-X has not been moved
10	into evidence. I take it at this time, you are not
11	yet moving Exhibit 22-X into evidence.
12	MR. LANE: That is correct.
13	BY MR. LANE:
14	Q Mr. Mooney, does this look like another
15	<u>CableVision Magazine</u> ? That's the logo?
16	A It looks like <u>CableVision Magazine</u> , yes.
17	Q Do you recall seeing an ad similar to the
18	one that is attached to Exhibit 22-X?
19	A No. I'm not sure who this ad is aimed at.
20	Q Well who is <u>CableVision Magazine</u> aimed at?
21	A Well, it's aimed at people who have an
22	interest in the cable television industry. That goes
23	way down to just operators.
24	Q This ad indicates that you can offer your
25	local accounts up to 12 minutes per hour with most of
	NEAL R. GROSS

those minutes available during evening and prime. Do you see that?

Q Were those -- does that evening and prime, do you think that meant the same evening and prime time hours that you were discussing?

A Well I will testify again that I have no idea what this ad means. It is my firm understanding of the statute, and I do know something about this statute, that carriers can not do anything to alter those signals. That means, add from them, delete from them, change them in any way. Nor can cable operators insert into these signals their ads. I don't know what WWOR can do.

Quite frankly, I have never heard of the superstations offering local avails. Quite frankly, I don't know that legally they are in a position to do so. I don't know. But I do know about the carriers and the cable operators. I really do not know what this ad is about or what it is aimed at.

Q Did you recall any litigation during the 1991 or 1992 periods that would have been involved in local ad avails?

A No. I do not. That is not to say that there wasn't any, but I just don't recall any. There

긔	is constantly litigation going on in this field under
2	a variety of subjects, some of which would interest us
3	at the trade association, and some of which would not
4	in any direct way.
5	Q And something about ad avails on super
6	stations wouldn't interest you?
7	A Counselor, I had plenty of things to worry
8	about without prospecting for new things to worry
9	about by reading the ads in the trade press. If
10	somebody brought it to my attention there was a
11	problem, then I'd say well it's probably a problem for
12	us. I have no recollection whatsoever of any of this.
13	Q Of anybody bringing this to your
14	attention?
15	A Right. Yes, I do not.
16	Q On page six, you also refer, do you not,
17	to the increases in operator spending doubling from
18	1986 to 1993. Do you see that?
19	A Page six?
20	Q Yes.
21	A Yes.
22	Q That information I take it was obtained
23	from the NCTA television development cited there?
24	A Yes.
25	MR. LANE: I'd like to offer into evidence

1	23-X, and ask Mr. Mooney if this is a copy of that
2	NCTA cable television development which you refer in
3	your testimony.
4	(Whereupon, the document was
5	marked for identification as PS
6	Exhibit 23-X).
7	BY MR. LANE:
8	Q Is it the same one, Mr. Mooney?
9	A It appears to be, yes.
10	Q Would you look at page 7A of Exhibit 23-X?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Is that where you got the numbers to which
13	you refer on page six of your testimony?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Now it refers, does it not, to in the
16	source for those figures to US Copyright Office data?
17	A Yes, as well as the Paul Kagan
18	Q As well as other things, right?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Could you tell us what the U.S. Copyright
21	Office data included therein is?
22	A No. I was not personally in charge of
23	assembling these statistics at any time.
24	Q Do you know whether that was royalty data?
25	A I have no idea. I don't know why it
	NEAL R. GROSS

shouldn't have been royalty data. It's a program expenditure. 2 I ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: I'm sorry, 3 couldn't hear. 4 THE WITNESS: I don't know why it wouldn't 5 include royalty data, because royalties are a form of 6 expenditure for programming, but I don't know the 7 answer to that. 8 BY MR. LANE: 9 And you don't know how any of the other 1.0 figures were derived on this table I take it? 11 I know that they were derived by 12 Α people professional competent to do it, but it was not 13 the sort of thing that I would supervise myself. 14 Do you know what the royalty, how the 15 royalty funds grew during the period 1986 to 1993? 16 17 Α Ouite a lot, I think. I'm not sure of that, but I imagine they grew substantially. I do not 18 have any specific knowledge of that in my head. 19 Do you know whether they went up or down 20 0 after 1990 from what they had been in 1989, for 21 example? 22 I don't know. I do not know what the Α 23 numbers were in any of those years. 24 Do you have any recollection of something 25 Q

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

that may have occurred in 1990 that would have 1 decreased the royalty payments by cable systems? 2 Not off the top of my head. Syndex went 3 into effect in 1990. 4 Do you know that that was a pattern effect 5 0 6 on the royalty rates? If it dropped, if it reduced carriage of 7 Α distant signals, then presumably that would be a 8 negative factor in the total pool. But there would be 9 other things going on that would be positive factors 10 tending to push it up. But I don't have in my head 11 the necessary data to make that comparison. 12 I do believe that if Syndex did result in 13 signals being dropped, that was what the proponents of 14 Syndex wanted, the Hollywood people, the program 15 owners, the broadcasters and so forth. 16 don't know whether there 17 O You separate Syndex rate before and after 1990? 18 There was something called the 19 Α Syndex surcharge, but I don't have it clear in my mind 20 21 exactly what it was. On page seven of your testimony just above 22 the title, you refer to the commercial circumstances 23 under which I take it the super station signals were 24 made available comparatively speaking, increasingly 25 NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

expensive and inflexible. Α Yes. 2 Could you describe what you mean there? 3 I think the key to that is the Α Sure. 4 words comparatively speaking. Carriage of super 5 stations, the circumstances and manner in which they 6 may be carried, the fees which must be paid as 7 royalties in return for their carriage are 8 by 9 established by law, either by statute regulation. 10 Whereas the commercial circumstances under 11 which cable networks are carried are decided by 12 contract, where there typically can be a lot of give 13 and take in terms of how much is charged as a license 14 fee, what avails are made available, the quality of 15 the avails, are they in prime time or are they in less 16 desirable day parts and other kinds of commercial 17 concessions which might be made in either direction. 18 There is a lot of difference between that 19 and something that's set up by the statute and 20 regulation. 21 Couldn't the cable operators adjust their 22 royalty rates by re-tiering, for example? 23 You mean could they -- are you inquiring 24 25 whether the cable operators could reduce their royalty NEAL R. GROSS

rates by putting distant signals on a lower tier, separating them out from the cable network?

Q Exactly.

A They might. Yes. I suppose they probably would lose royalty rates somewhat. But they also might reduce gross revenues. They might have more people than they'd like go to the lower tier. That's a form of gambling most of them are probably unwilling to undertake.

O But they had that ability?

A Are you talking about putting the super stations et al down only on the lower tier?

Q They could do anything they want with their tiering, couldn't they? There is no limitation under the --

A I just think about this in terms of commercial practicality. I mean most people want the broader tier of basic and do in fact buy the broader tier of basic. If the super stations or any other distant signal are on that tier, the cable operator has to pay royalties on 100 percent of the revenues derived from that tier whether or not the super station or other signal also appears as part of the program offering on a lower tier.

You know, you've got to be careful that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	you are cutting off your nose to spite your face here
2	if you try to force, if you become so preoccupied with
3	your copyright royalty rates that you try to force
4	them down in a way that is hostile to the interests of
5	your customer.
6	Q But they could take the royalty payments
7	into account if they wanted in deciding what monthly
8	rate.
9	A How to tier?
10	. Q Yes. How to tier and what monthly rate to
11	charge for the tiers.
12	A Well, not entirely. Are you talking about
13	today or 1990, 1992?
14	Q 1990 to 1992.
15	A Yes. They could.
16	Q They could also drop distant signals if
17	they felt it was too expensive to carry them, right?
18	A Sure. Yes, they could.
19	Q There is no limit on that in the statute?
20	A There's no legal limit, no. There are
21	commercial disincentives to doing that. If it was all
22	that easy, they would just exceed to the repeal of the
23	compulsory license in its entirety.
24	Q Turning to page eight of your testimony,
25	sir. In the long paragraph towards the bottom of the
į	NEAL B. GROSS

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

page you talk about the backyard dish controversy at the late 1980s. Could you describe what that was?

Until 1979, the Government had a policy individuals prohibited as which effectively individuals from owning satellite receiver dishes. Ιt through a requirement that people maintained satellite receiver dishes be licensed. Then it described the license terms in such a way as commercially impracticable for it individuals to use what we now call backyard dishes in a residential setting.

Those rules, however, were repealed in 1979. As the word spread, particularly in rural communities during the 1980s, that if you went out and bought one of these backyard dishes, you could take down all of the cable and other programming up on the satellite for free, they began to proliferate, particularly in the western and southern states, places where there are substantial rural populations.

At some point, the people who own the programming became alarmed that their property was effectively being given away because there was no encryption, no coding of these signals. They were in the clear, and anybody with a backyard dish could just take it and use it.

As most of these people who own the programming or who own the networks that had organized the programming would in the subscription television business, they decided that wasn't a very good idea. So they sought to scramble, it was a term in the industry, the signals, so that they could effectively make a business out of selling the rights to code.

There ensued a great political squabble with the people who had the backyard dishes and the people who were selling backyard dishes saying this is unfair to rural people, and we shouldn't have to pay for what comes through the airwaves and so forth. That caused us a lot of problems.

Q You refer to the fact that this pitted cable interests against the C-band. Could you just describe what the C-band is?

A C-band is the technical description of the backyard -- of the satellite receiver dish technology as it was in use at that time.

Q So it pitted the cable interests against the C-band dealers claim that all they wanted was a fair analog to the cable compulsory license. What do you mean?

A That was the line of attack which was taken by much of the C-band lobby.

NEAL R. GROSS

긔	Did that lead to section if:
2	A Is that what it is, section 119?
3	Q Yes.
4	A Of the
5	Q Satellite carrier royalty provisions.
6	A Are you talking copyright now?
7	Q Yes.
8	A Yes. It did. I had something to do with
9	that.
10	Q Is that what you were just talking about
11	in your testimony here?
12	A No. Not at all. Not even remotely.
13	Q All right.
14	A No. All 119 did, and I think I know what
15	you are referring to, was extend to the backyard dish
16	business the same compulsory license which then was in
17	the copyright act with respect to cable operators
18	using broadcast signals. It was only about broadcast
19	signals.
20	What the dish people wanted was a right to
21	make what the dish dealers wanted was a right to
22	have a distribution contract with the cable networks
23	so that if somebody was going to be selling CNN or HBO
24	or whatever to people who own backyard dishes, it
25	could be them, and people who own the dishes would not

have to deal with cable operators.

There were not two sides to this. There were three or four or five sides. The people who owned the dishes were not necessarily the same as the people who were selling the dishes. But the people who were selling the dishes were better organized politically than the people who owned them. In any event, used the cause of the people who owned them to advance their commercial claims at Congress. That is what I was talking about.

It made a big problem for us, particularly in the Senate with senators from western and southern states who said you are a bunch of bad guys because you are trying to shut down this source of programming which is so valuable to my constituents. We would say no, we're just trying to sell it because it is subscription TV. There the issue was drawn.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Now they were taking broadcast signals?

THE WITNESS: They were taking everything. They were taking HBO, broadcast signals, the whole deal. Our position was that if the Congress wanted to -- if equal treatment was the issue, then what the Congress ought to do was build them in the Copyright Act to give them the same access to broadcast signals

1||

as cable has.

But that if the issue was whether these dish dealers should have a right to have a contract with HBO, to distribute HBO in the backyard dish market, that would be for Government to intervene in an unprecedented way in these markets.

Cable operators didn't have a right, a legal right to have a contract to be an NBC affiliate. You know, the law and the public policy represented by the law recognized and in fact approved of NBC being a broadcast network. That was the business they were in. We didn't see why HBO couldn't be just a cable network. Why it had to be a backyard dish network too. We lost that fight, which was essentially an argument about competition, monopolies, and so forth.

But it was the dish people who started it and who popularized it in the Senate, and who created a group of senators there who were very unhappy with us.

BY MR. LANE:

Q And that, the last answer described what you mean by the equal insistence on equal treatment, page eight of your testimony?

A Yes. What I am describing here really is the circumstances under which political controversy

arose that was troubling to us. What was going on at a certain point, at a certain time during the development of this controversy was that people kept throwing back to us that this is just like the compulsory license. What's the matter with you, why can't you agree that someone else should have the same benefit of the walk that you have.

We kept saying it is not like the compulsory license. It is different. But you know, in a political forum, you don't always get too far with fine distinctions when you get a lot of angry constituents on the other end.

But I could have done without that, having to sit in front of those committees and just have them pound on me all day, with what's the difference rhetoric.

Q Would you turn to page 10 of your testimony, please? On the second and third line you refer to teams franchise agreements and a degree of geographic exclusivity. Could you tell us what you mean by that?

A Yes. There apparently is a part of the operating assumptions in professional sports that the game, whatever the game happens to be, baseball, basketball, football, whatever, is helped by

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

attempting to foster a sense of regional identity with individual teams.

they divide the country up franchise areas and you know, in this area I quess we're part of the Orioles area in this area. Ι shouldn't say we, I just moved. I'm now part of the Mariners area. Where here you hear Orioles, Orioles, Orioles all the time, you go to the Pacific Northwest and you hear Mariners, Mariners, Mariners. how the system works in all of the major sports. is applied to television. It is frequently applied to television rights, contracts as well.

You know, the Orioles not only are the only baseball team around here, but they also are the most frequently appearing team on TV. One of the things that the distant signal thing did was to go around that and allow the development of national affinities to individual teams, like the Braves.

- geographic exclusivity is Q is it not, that applies to syndicated something, series and movies when you license that to a station?
 - Geographic exclusivity?
 - Yes. 0
- Only within the market of a station, which Α typically are not nearly as broad as sports.

1	Q But those I'm sorry. Were you
2	finished?
3	A Yes.
4	Q But those license agreements would have a
5	geographic exclusive area for the syndicated series
6	and movies. Right?
7	A I believe that the rules prohibit the
8	station from buying exclusivity in an area larger than
9	the one it is licensed to serve.
10	Q Now you refer, in just continuing along
11	that same paragraph, that WTBS could not as a
12	practical matter, would not as a practical matter,
13	have the ability to contract for a national
14	distribution of individual team sports programming?
15	A Right.
16	Q Were you aware that major league baseball
17	had an agreement with WTBS concerning the nationwide
18	distribution of Braves baseball games?
19	A Yes. There was some kind of an
20	arrangement there. I don't know what the details are.
21	Q And were you also aware that WTBS
22	purchased the national rights to an NBA package of
23	games?
24	A No. I am not aware of it.
25	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Could you clarify,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

now.

or rather explain a little more why you feel that a distant signal like TBS would not be able to get a contract for national programming? It's all a matter of negotiating, isn't it?

THE WITNESS: It goes against the system.

ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: They are doing it

THE WITNESS: They are doing it on a limited basis. I think that one of the things that -- and I'm not -- I don't want to go beyond my expertise in this area. You know, they don't publish all the details of their contracts in the paper or call me up and tell me what is in them.

But I think that one of the factors that was very important in whatever the deal was that was done between Turner interests and major league baseball was that it was done within the context of an eckstand (phonetic) compulsory license and an understanding on the part of both sides that the compulsory license was probably going to continue in law, and that Turner would be able to continue to do what he did.

I think what he effectively did was bought some kind of political piece with the commissioner and with the other team owners, but I don't know that

1	(No response.)
2	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: What page is that,
3	Mr. Lane?
4	MR. LANE: It was in his last answer, Mr.
5	Chairman.
6	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay.
7	THE WITNESS: Regional distribution of
8	sports?
9	BY MR. LANE:
10	Q Yes.
11	A I mean the distribution of sporting events
12	via television within a geographic region. I am not
13	trying to be flippant, I don't understand the
14	question.
15	Q Is one of the ways that sports is
16	distributed regionally by regional sports networks?
17	A Yes.
18	MR. LANE: I'd like to introduce as 24-X -
19	- I'm going to hand a copy of the original book to Mr.
20	Mooney, a document entitled "Regional Sports Network
21	Media Guide" March 1992.
22	(Whereupon, the document was
23	marked for identification as PS
24	24-X.)
25	BY MR. LANE:

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	Q This was published by NCTA, was it not,
2	Mr. Mooney?
3	A Yes. Apparently so.
4	Q You were the president and CEO of NCTA in
5	March of 1992. Right?
6	A Yes. I was.
7	Q This purports to be a listing of regional
8	sports networks. Did you have a chance to look
9	through this?
10	A No. I flipped through it. I could see
11	basically what it is, but I don't it's a big book.
12	Basically it's mostly information.
13	Q Information about?
14	A Provided by the various sports networks
15	themselves, bound up together in this book for
16	distribution to cable operators.
17	Q And are these regional sports networks
18	with which you are familiar?
19	A Not terribly, no. This is the sort of
20	thing that would have been produced by the industry
21	communications department without a lot of discussion,
22	or indeed probably without any discussion with me.
23	This is the sort of thing that the trade association
24	did as a matter of course, and I'm not familiar with
25	it. I have no recollection of it.
	1 D 0000

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Ι

1	Q That's entitled, "Regional video
2	Services."
3	A Yes.
4	Q This was compiled at the same time as the
5	other information I take it, on which you relied in
6	your testimony.
7	A This seems to be an April, 1994 book.
8	Q But this is one to which you specifically
9	referred in your testimony as you relying.
10	A Yes. I referred to the book. I didn't
11	refer to that part of it. I referred to the numbers
12	in front about subscriber levels and program basis.
13	Q And if you look at each of the entries in
14	this, let's just sticking with page 41-C, it has an
15	entry, date service began. Do you see that?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And that entry is contained in each of
18	these. Is it not?
19	A It looks as if the format provides for
20	that. I guess it's probably safe to assume that it
21	does, but I don't know that each and every one of them
22	has that in it. Somebody might have left it out.
23	Q Looking through the regional video
24	networks again, I don't want to get into the
25	substance, but these are largely comprised of sports
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	networks. Are they not?
2	A There are a lot of news channels in there
3	too. I see, actually it looks to me, I haven't
4	counted them, but they are in alphabetical order.
5	They are not organized by subject matter, so it's hard
6	to tell, but a lot of them are sports channels, yes.
7	Q And a lot of news channels?
8	A Yes. A lot of news channels too.
9	Particularly in one little clump between pages 45 and
10	
11	Q And I take it this was again compiled by
12	the NCTA staff?
13	A This book?
14	Q Yes.
15	A I assume it was, yes. I was not there in
16	1994 when this book was published.
17	Q You have no reason to rely on just
18	A I assume it was. It was probably
19	something that the research department did.
20	MR. LANE: If you could just indulge me
21	for a moment, Mr. Chairman.
22	I have no further questions of Mr. Mooney.
23	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Thank you, Mr. Lane.
24	MR. LANE: Just so that in my usual
25	fashion, I would move now for the admission of 21-X,
	NEAL D. CDOSS

22-X, 23-X, and 24-X.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

All right. Any CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: objections to any of these exhibits?

MR. GERSCH: Yes. We object to 21-X and 22-X on identical grounds. I think these are quite I don't think that they are correct misleading. response with respect to the grounds that they are misleading.

What these are are advertisements for ad space in programs which have been substituted for what WOR regularly carries in its local market as a result of the Syndex rules, so that when WOR is then carried as a distant signal into a distant market, Eastern Microwave, the receiver referred to in the ad which the satellite, they strip out the original programming on OR, which is what's subject to the compulsory license. They substitute in their own programming not subject to the compulsory license, and for which Mr. Lane's clients are not seeking credit for. And then they can sell ad space on it.

But it's entirely irrelevant to this proceeding because the ads are being sold in the context of the programming which has been stripped out and substituted in.

If you look, when you have an opportunity

1	this evening, if you look at Dr. Lemieux's testimony
2	at page 25, he has a sample of WOR's line-up. If you
3	can just see it from here, this is WOR's line-up on a
4	given day. Here in the middle of prime time, and
5	indeed, for almost half the day they have stripped out
6	because of the Syndex rules, much of their
7	programming. That programming that has now been
8	stripped out has been replaced by programming which is
9	not subject to the compulsory license, not relevant to
10	this proceeding.
11	So the fact that there are ads in that
12	substituted programming does not mean anything. That
13	is my basis for objecting on the grounds that it is
14	misleading. The other basis
15	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Misleading I gather
16	is irrelevant?
17	MR. GERSCH: It is irrelevant and
18	misleading, yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: It's irrelevant?
20	And you have grounds for you said also sponsorship?
21	MR. GERSCH: Yes. Mr. Mooney said that he
22	had no idea what these ads were and certainly can not
23	be treated as a sponsoring witness.
24	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Does anybody else
25	object?

MR. MIDLEN: Devotionals would join that objection.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Mr. Lane, a response?

MR. LANE: Yes. Mr. Chairman, and members of the panel, if you look at pages six and seven in Mr. Mooney's testimony, at the bottom of the page he states satellite carriers offering these signals obviously can adjust the transport fees they charged operators, et cetera, et cetera. Then going over to the top of page seven, it says, "Nor are they able to offer incentives such as local add avails" et cetera, et cetera.

What is I think a fair reading that testimony is satellite carriers are unable to offer local ad avails.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: What? I'm sorry.

MR. LANE: Okay? This Exhibit 21 and 22 are ads which Mr. Mooney agreed are from Eastern Microwave/WWOR. Eastern Microwave is the satellite carrier that offers WWOR. Quite clearly, they offer local add avails. It didn't say what kind of programs. I completely agree with Mr. Gersch that these are in the blacked-out programs. There is no doubt about that.

NEAL R. GROSS

But the important point that Mr. Mooney was making is whether they could offer an incentive or not. He said they could not. I am offering these ads to show that indeed they could and they did during the relevant time period.

So I believe it is absolutely relevant and right on point, and joins his testimony at pages six and seven.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Concerning sponsorship?

MR. LANE: Concerning sponsorship, I think the ads speak for themselves. Mr. Mooney indicated that he was aware of <u>CableVision Magazine</u>. There is no question about the authenticity of this ad. It's a magazine that he indicated was trade press and targeted towards cable operators. I think he can sponsor it. Whether he agrees with what is in it or not is a different question.

CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: So are we talking about two different things here? Are we talking about the use of this as an exhibit for cross examination as opposed to an admission into evidence where it can be considered as substantive evidence?

So you are not offering it now merely to impeach Mr. Mooney. You are offering it for the

NEAL R. GROSS

idea what these were. So on the sponsorship basis 1 alone, these can not come in, regardless of what Mr. 2 Lane would like to do. 3 If he wants them to come in, he'd need his 4 I am pleased to see, however, that he own witness. 5 does concede that in fact these exhibits do relate to 6 the advertising on programs substituted for that which 7 was stripped out under the Syndex. I think that's 8 another reason why it's irrelevant. But I don't think 9 it can come in, because Mr. Mooney has no idea what 10 these ads are about, and so stated. 11 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: All right. Mr. 12 Midlen? 13 MR. MIDLEN: I agree. I would add that I 14 think that based on what Mr. Lane has said, is the 15 purpose for which he wants to use them. 16 appropriate way to go would be for these to come in, 17 if in fact they do, by a sponsoring witness during the 18 rebuttal section of the hearing. 19 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: We'll take a short 20 recess before I rule on the motion. 21 (Whereupon, from 5:13 p.m. until 5:16 p.m. 22 the proceedings went off the record.) 23 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: The motion to admit 24 the exhibits number 22 and 21 will be allowed, that 25 NEAL R. GROSS

1	there is appropriate sponsorship and it is relevant.
2	(Whereupon, the documents
3	previously marked as Exhibits
4	21-X and 22-X were admitted
5	into evidence.)
6	The other exhibits?
7	MR. GERSCH: No objection.
8	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Any objection,
9	counsel?
10	MS. HAND: No.
11	(Whereupon, the documents
12	previously marked as Exhibits
13	23-X and 24-X were admitted
14	into evidence.)
15	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Is there any other
16	cross examination of Mr. Mooney?
17	MS. HAND: No.
18	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Any redirect
19	examination?
20	MR. GERSCH: No.
21	CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: Okay, Mr. Mooney,
22	thank you very much.
23	ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: I have one question,
24	Mr. Mooney, very simple I think. Your introductory
25	information tells us you were president and CEO of
	NEAL R. GROSS

NCTA through June of 1993. What have you been doing 1 since then? What are you doing now? 2 THE WITNESS: Oh. I give public police 3 advice to cable companies. 4 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: As a consultant? 5 THE WITNESS: As a consultant. 6 ARBITRATOR WERTHEIM: Thank you. 7 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 8 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: It's 5:15. There's 9 no other witnesses today. Your witness tomorrow is? 10 MR. GERSCH: Larry Gerbrandt, Paul Kagan 11 and Associates. 12 CHAIRPERSON JIGANTI: That will conclude 13 the proceedings today. 14 (Whereupon, at 5:20 p.m. the proceedings 15 went off the record.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of:

Hearing: Distribution of 1990, 1991

and 1992 Cable Royalty Funds

Before:

Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date:

December 11, 1995

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

Charles Report